arXiv:1405.0820v1 [hep-th] 5 May 2014

Quantum mechanics probes superspace

Stam Nicolis[1]
CNRS–Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique (UMR 7350)
Fédération de Recherche "Denis Poisson" (FR 2964)
Département de Physique
Université "François Rabelais" de Tours
Parc Grandmont, Tours 37200, France

Abstract

We study quantum mechanics in one space dimension in the stochastic formalism. We show that the partition function of the theory is, in fact, equivalent to that of a model, whose action is explicitly invariant (up to surface terms) under supersymmetry transformations–but whose invariance under the stochastic identities is not obvious, due to an apparent mismatch between fermions and bosons. The resolution of the riddle is that one "fermion" is a gauge artifact and, upon fixing the local, fermionic symmetry, called $\kappa-$symmetry, we recover the stochastic partition function.

The "fermions" do not propagate in the bulk, since their kinetic term is a total derivative. Their contribution to the action is through an ultra–local bilinear term, that may be exactly integrated out, as long as the superpotential has a unique minimum and we obtain a local action for the scalar. When the superpotential does not have a unique minimum, we use a Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation of the kinetic term to obtain an action in terms of the Fourier transform of the velocity, a kind of duality transformation.

The classical particle thus moves in a medium of dipoles, that parametrize the quantum fluctuations and the classical trajectory $\phi(\tau)$, becomes a chiral superfield, $(\phi(\tau), \psi_\alpha(\tau), F(\tau))$, when quantum effects are taken into account. The observable superpartner of the scalar, however, is the fermion bilinear and thus, while supersymmetry may be realized, the observable partner excitations are not degenerate in mass.

We compute the stochastic identities of the auxiliary field, using a lattice regularization of the equivalent "bosonic" action, for the case of a superpotential with a single minimum. We show that the lattice action can be expressed as an ultra–local functional of the auxiliary field, up to terms that vanish with the lattice spacing.

[1]E-Mail: Stam.Nicolis@lmpt.univ-tours.fr

1 Introduction

The stochastic approach to quantum dynamics of commuting degrees of freedom starts with the Langevin equation

$$\frac{\partial\phi(t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial U(\phi)}{\partial\phi(t)} + \eta(t) \tag{1}$$

where t is the equilibration time. The field, $\eta(t)$, is a Gaussian stochastic process:

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle\eta(t\rangle = 0 \\ \langle\eta(t)\eta(t')\rangle = \delta(t-t') \\ \langle\eta(t_1)\eta(t_2)\cdots\eta(t_{2n})\rangle = \sum_\pi \left\langle\eta(t_{\pi(1)})\eta(t_{\pi(2)})\right\rangle\cdots\left\langle\eta(t_{\pi(2n-1)})\eta(t_{\pi(2n)})\right\rangle \end{array} \tag{2}$$

where the sum is over all permutations. (We work in units where $\hbar = 1$.)

At equilibrium, $t \to \infty$,

$$\eta = \frac{\partial U(\phi)}{\partial\phi} \tag{3}$$

We haven't yet committed to whether η and ϕ depend on other variables; if they don't, we have a problem in probability theory, that is interesting, not only in its own right, but can, also, provide insights for physics [1]. If they do, we have a *bona fide* problem in quantum field theory, where the noise, η, models the fluctuations [2, 3]. Indeed, depending on how we interpret the coefficient of the 2–point function of the stochastic field, η, this framework can describe quantum fluctuations, if the coefficient is proportional to $\hbar$, thermal fluctuations, if it is proportional to $k_{\rm B}T$, or disorder, if it is proportional to the "strength of the noise" (cf. the paper by Aron *et al.* in ref. [2] for an example of non-Gaussian noise in this framework).

If $U(\phi)$ is a local functional of ϕ, in particular, if

$$\frac{\partial U(\phi)}{\partial\phi} = \frac{\partial\phi(\tau)}{\partial\tau} + \frac{\partial W(\phi)}{\partial\phi(\tau)} \tag{4}$$

where $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $W(\phi(\tau))$ an ultralocal functional of $\phi(\tau)$, we obtain the following stochastic equation for $\phi(\tau)$:

$$\frac{\partial\phi(\tau)}{\partial\tau} = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi(\tau)} + \eta(\tau) \tag{5}$$

This is the Langevin equation that describes quantum mechanics, i.e. a quantum field theory in one Euclidian dimension. The essential difference to eq. (1) is that we are not interested, only, in the limit $\tau \to \infty$, but in the solution for all values of τ. This assertion is meaningful only at the level of the correlation functions, of course.

In this case, $\eta(\tau)$ is a Gaussian stochastic process, whose correlation functions obey the same identities as in eq. (2), only the time is, now, the Euclidian time.

We are interested in the correlation functions, $\langle\phi(\tau_1)\phi(\tau_2)\cdots\phi(\tau_n)\rangle$, of the field ϕ and the identities that constrain them. We shall compute them from the following partition function

$$\begin{aligned} Z = &\int [d\eta(\tau)d\phi(\tau)]\, e^{-\int d\tau \frac{\eta(\tau)^2}{2}}\, \delta\left(\eta(\tau) - \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau} - \frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi(\tau)}\right) = \\ &\int [d\phi(\tau)]\, e^{-\int d\tau\, \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau}+\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi(\tau)}\right)^2} \left|\det\left(\delta(\tau-\tau')\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}+\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial\phi(\tau)^2}\right)\right)\right| = \\ &\int [d\phi(\tau)d\psi(\tau)]\, e^{-\int d\tau\, \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau}+\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi(\tau)}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int d\tau\, d\tau'\, \psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\left(\delta(\tau-\tau')\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}+\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial\phi(\tau)^2}\right)\right)\psi_\beta(\tau')} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

We have introduced the determinant of the local operator, $\partial^2 U/\partial\phi(\tau)\partial\phi(\tau')$, in the action using anticommuting fields, $\psi_\alpha(\tau)$. These are *not* ghosts! There isn't any spin in one dimension–so the spin–statistics theorem is vacuous [4].

This is a formal expression, since the measure, $[d\phi(\tau)d\psi(\tau)]$, is not well-defined and the determinant of the operator is not well-defined either. Indeed, the passage from the first line to the second only holds, if the determinant can't vanish–if it can, then, already, the first line is ill-defined, since the delta function doesn't fully constrain the function $\eta(\tau)$. So what we really are after is a way to *define* the expression in the third line–and use *that* definition to define the expression in the first line.

Let us discuss a bit more, why exactly the transformations in eq. (6) are interesting.

They are interesting because they express the fact that, while the function, $\phi(\tau)$, may have a quite complicated distribution–the object of our study!–there exists a functional of $\phi(\tau)$,

$$\eta(\tau) = \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi(\tau)} \tag{7}$$

that is a Gaussian field, with ultra–local two–point function–it's a *non–propagating* field–in contrast to $\phi(\tau)$, whose propagator, $\langle\phi(\tau)\phi(\tau')\rangle$, is, *a priori*, not ultra–local. This is very surprising. There are two cases, where such fields are known to appear: (a) when a gauge symmetry is present and these fields express the redundancy of the degrees of freedom and/or (b) when supersymmetry is present and these fields are the auxiliary fields that ensure it is realized off–shell [5, 6]. So a natural question is, whether it's possible to understand which case is realized in the class of theories described by the partition function in eq. (6). Of course it may happen that none is realized, if the partition function cannot be defined, absent a cutoff. (In fact, as we shall find, both cases are realized: a gauge symmetry is, indeed, present and auxiliary fields do appear.)

We shall try to elucidate these issues in this paper, in a context that allows us to perform calculations in a controlled way. For, indeed, the reason eq. (6) is, also, useful, is that it provides the framework to perform calculations that are not limited to perturbation theory. We use a lattice regularization and compute the correlation functions by Monte Carlo simulations. A check on our numerical calculations is thus provided by the identities that stem from the Gaussian distribution of $\eta(\tau)$. The classical equations of motion imply that the right–hand side of eq. (7) is drawn from the same Gaussian distribution as $\eta(\tau)$ so, if we can compute the

correlation functions of the scalar, we can check, whether quantum corrections respect this–or not.

Such calculations seem to involve "dynamical fermions"–since the "classical action" contains a term such as $\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\partial\psi_\beta(\tau)/\partial\tau$– and, thus, seem very challenging (albeit much less than in four space-time dimensions). A nice feature of quantum mechanics, however, is that the "fermion" kinetic term is a total derivative–individual "fermions" do not propagate in the bulk, only "fermion" bilinears, whose propagator is completely determined by the correlation functions of the scalar, propagate: The fermions are "confined" in dipoles, can be exactly integrated out and leave behind a "Polyakov loop" of a functional of the scalar–that makes an ultra–local contribution to the action.

For ease of exposition we shall use the terms "bosonic" (or "scalar") resp. "fermionic" to denote "commuting" resp. "anticommuting" worldline fields. They are, of course, both, "target space" scalars.

The plan of the paper is as follows: in section 2 we study, whether the classical action in eq. (6) is invariant under a transformation, whose parameters are anticommuting variables and whose anticommutator closes on translations in Euclidian time. The difficulty in realizing this symmetry, already at the classical level, as we shall see, stems from the *local* terms, those that contain derivatives. We show that the "fermionic" kinetic term is, always, a total derivative, therefore the "fermions" appear as ultra–local bilinears on the boundary and in the bulk. We recall that an action, that contains *two* "fermions"–and one "boson"–*is* invariant under such transformations and that one of the "fermions" is a gauge artifact, since only one of them enters in the action with a time derivative, they transform differently under the supersymmetry transformations and we may choose which one transforms which way. This gauge symmetry is known as $\kappa-$symmetry [7]. The constraints, that project out the "spurious" fermion, are "pure spinor" type constraints. Introducing a (non covariant) gauge-fixing term, we show that the gauge-fixed partition function coincides with that of the stochastic approach. We shall use this (gauge-fixed) partition function to compute the relations between the correlation functions of the auxiliary field that stem from Wick's theorem and, thereby, check supersymmetry beyond the classical action. We, also, discuss why the "second" fermion is necessary, within the context of a consistent quantum mechanics and that the "observable" superpartner of the "scalar", $\phi(\tau)$, is another scalar, the fermion bilinear, $\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau) \equiv \mathfrak{s}(\tau)$, whose correlation functions may be computed from the correlation functions of $\exp(-\log W''(\phi(\tau)))$.

In section 3 we set up the framework to compute the relations between the correlation functions using a lattice regularization. We first treat the case where $W''(\phi)$ never vanishes. We explicitly show that the change of variables from the scalar to the auxiliary field, within the lattice discretization, does lead to a Gaussian distribution for the auxiliary field, with an ultra–local 2–point function, up to terms that vanish as powers of the lattice spacing, or are surface terms.

In subsection 3.2 we show how the calculation may be set up, when $W''(\phi)$ can vanish, i.e. fermionic zeromodes are present. This case is quite involved, so we do not present, yet, numerical results for it here, only several consistency checks of the expressions involved to show

they are well-defined. Specifically we show that the appropriate field seems to be not $\phi(\tau)$, but $p(\tau)$, the Fourier transform of its time derivative, $d\phi(\tau)/d\tau$, through a Hubbard–Stratonovich transform, that linearizes the kinetic term of the scalar.

The numerical results, for the case $W''(\phi) > 0$, are presented in section 4. We show that the 1–point function of the auxiliary field does vanish, within the precision of the Monte Carlo simulation, the 2–point function vanishes, within precision, for non–zero values of its argument and that the connected part of the 4–point function vanishes, as well. These results are all compatible with the auxiliary field being drawn from a Gaussian distribution, centered at zero and with ultra–local propagator, thereby confirming supersymmetry of the partition function. We cannot, yet, complete the proof by showing that all correlation functions of the auxiliary field satisfy Wick's theorem, however. Completing the induction step remains, thus, an open problem. While for the 1–point function the proof is complete, the proof for the 2–point function requires that we show that the irrelevant terms we have discarded, when writing the action as a perfect square, do remain irrelevant. This would, in fact, suffice to complete the proof for all correlation functions.

We end with our conclusions and ideas about directions of further inquiry. One natural direction is towards more than one Euclidian dimensions: $\phi(\tau) \to \phi^I(\tau), \psi_\alpha(\tau) \to \psi^I_\alpha(\tau), F(\tau) \to F^I(\tau)$, $I = 1, 2, \ldots, D$, describing a $D-$dimensional target space(time), in the classical case– and the corresponding superspace in the quantum case. The $\psi^I_\alpha(\tau)$ may then be identified with the components of the spin vector [29], contributing a Pauli term, $\psi^I_\alpha \sigma_1^{\alpha\beta} \psi^J_\beta F_{IJ}(\phi)$, where $F_{IJ}(\phi)$ is the electromagnetic field strength, whereas the classical coordinates $\phi^I(\tau)$ couple, directly, to the gauge potential through the term $\dot{\phi}^I A_I$.

The generalization to field and string theory [30, 31] is, of course, one goal. One way to attain it might be through the worldline formalism to field theory [38].

Another is how to describe entanglement. This topic has, so far, been treated, in the canonical formalism, in terms of density matrices. The path integral approach, presented here, should be able to provide a space-time description of entanglement. To achieve this we must describe two–particle configurations in the stochastic formalism. Intuitively we expect that two, classically non-interacting, particles will exhibit entanglement if they interact with the same noise configuration. How this may be achieved in practice will be described in future work.

Some technical details are presented in the appendices, namely, how the "fermion" contribution encodes the more familiar loop expansion and how the correlation functions of the "superpartner" to the scalar are expressed in terms of the correlation functions of the scalar itself in a way that is reminiscent of disorder variables in spin models [11]. We, also, prove that, for the cubic superpotential, the partition function, defined by the dual variables, is, indeed, real and positive, by showing that the probability density the moments, implicitly, define is symmetric about the average value.

2 On the supersymmetry of the classical action

Let us look at $S_{\rm class}[\phi,\psi]$ more closely. It would seem that

$$S_{\rm class}[\phi,\psi]=\int d\tau\,\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial\phi(\tau)}\right)^2-\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial\phi(\tau)^2}\psi_\beta(\tau)\right] \tag{8}$$

is invariant under the non-linear transformation [2]

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\phi(\tau)&=\zeta_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)\\ \delta\psi_\alpha(\tau)&=\zeta_\alpha\frac{\partial U}{\partial\phi(\tau)}\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with $\zeta_\alpha,\alpha=1,2$, a pair of anti commuting variables.

This transformation can, in fact, be linearized by introducing an auxiliary field, $F(\tau)$, and writing the action as follows:

$$S_{\rm eff}[\phi,\psi,F]=\int d\tau\left[-\frac{1}{2}F(\tau)^2+F(\tau)\frac{\partial U}{\partial\phi(\tau)}-\frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial\phi(\tau)^2}\psi_\beta(\tau)\right] \tag{10}$$

The transformation (9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\phi(\tau)&=\zeta_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)\\ \delta\psi_\alpha(\tau)&=\zeta_\alpha F(\tau)\\ \delta F(\tau)&=0\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

If this transformation leaves the action invariant:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta S=&\int d\tau\,\left[FU''\delta\phi-\frac{1}{2}\delta\psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}U''\psi_\beta-\frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}U''\delta\psi_\beta\right]=\\ &\int d\tau\,\left[FU''\zeta_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_\alpha F\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}U''\psi_\beta-\frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\zeta_\beta U''F\right]\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

the expression in brackets in the second line should either vanish or become a total derivative.

This expression does vanish, if $[U'',\psi]=0=[U'',F]$, i.e. if U'' is an ultra–local functional. It fails to vanish, if U'' is not ultra–local, but contains derivatives, since, in that case, $U''\psi_\beta\neq\psi_\beta U''$ and $U''F\neq FU''$. Indeed, we remark that the ultra–local terms in U'' will cancel out in δS, but the local terms will not leave a total derivative. So there are terms missing in the transformation.

An easy calculation leads to the expression:

$$\delta S=\int d\tau\,\frac{1}{2}\left[\zeta_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\dot\psi_\beta F-\psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\zeta_\beta\dot F\right] \tag{13}$$

Now

$$\psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\zeta_\beta=\zeta_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta \tag{14}$$

since $\{\psi_\alpha, \zeta_\beta\} = 0$. Therefore

$$\delta S = \zeta_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \int d\tau \, \frac{1}{2} \left[F \dot{\psi}_\beta - \dot{F} \psi_\beta \right] \tag{15}$$

Were the relative sign a plus, instead of the minus, then we would have obtained a total derivative.

In fact transformations (11) are not the most general, linear in the fields, we can write, consistent with all symmetries (namely the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ transformations of the fermions). We can add the following terms to the variations of the fermion and the auxiliary field

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \psi_\alpha^{(1)} &= B_{\alpha\beta} \zeta_\beta \dot{\phi} \\ \delta F^{(1)} &= A \zeta_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \dot{\psi}_\beta = A \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \delta\phi \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

If we include these terms, we shall find that $A = 1$, but that the choice of $B_{\alpha\beta}$ doesn't have any effect at all in making the variation of the Lagrangan a total derivative. We realize that the action is *not* invariant under these transformations. Therefore we conclude that the stochastic identities satisfied by $\eta(\tau)$, as a functional of $\phi(\tau)$, seem logically distinct from invariance under transformations with anticommuting parameters, in the presence of derivatives. Indeed, the paradox becomes even more acute, if we consider the case $W = 0$. In that case, that of a massless, free, scalar, if we impose an infrared cutoff, by putting the system in a box, we do, apparently, find that $Z = 1$, since the contribution of the "bosonic" determinant, $\det(-d^2/d\tau^2)^{-1/2}$, seems to be exactly cancelled by the contribution of the "fermionic determinant, $\left|\det\left(\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} d/d\tau\right)\right|$, while the action is, apparently, not invariant under the transformations (11) (16).

In fact, let us write the variation of the action, under *arbitrary* variations, $\delta\phi, \delta F, \delta\psi_\alpha$, that vanish at the boundaries (or infinity). We find the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S = \int d\tau \, \Bigg[& \delta F \left(-F + \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \right) + \delta\phi \left(-\frac{\partial F}{\partial \tau} + F \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi^2} \right) + \\ & \delta\psi_\alpha \left(-\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi^2} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \delta\psi_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta \right) \Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The last term tells us that the fermions don't propagate in the "bulk"–and the next to last term that, unless the matrix $W''(\phi)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}$ has zero modes, the fermions vanish in the bulk, in the classical limit. Indeed, the kinetic term of the fermion is a total derivative:

$$\psi_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \frac{\partial \psi_\beta}{\partial \tau} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\psi_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \frac{\partial \psi_\beta}{\partial \tau} + \frac{\partial \psi_\alpha}{\partial \tau} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left(\frac{1}{2} \psi_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta \right) \tag{18}$$

and, therefore, contributes a surface term, whatever the variations are.

So there are further features of the relation between the stochastic identities and "supersymmetric" transformations that remain to be clarified.

It *is*, indeed, possible to write an action,

$$S_{\rm SUSYQM} = \int d\tau \left[-\frac{F^2}{2} + F\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}\right) - \psi_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} + \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial\phi^2}\right)\chi_\beta \right] \tag{19}$$

that contains derivatives and that is invariant–up to total derivatives–under transformations with anticommuting parameters [9, 10], for instance:

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_1\phi = -\zeta_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\chi_\beta \\ &\delta_1\psi_\alpha = -\zeta_\alpha\left(\dot\phi + F\right) \\ &\delta_1 F = \delta_1\dot\phi \\ &\delta_1\chi_\alpha = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Under this transformation we remark that the fermion χ_α, that does enter in the action through its derivative, is inert, whereas the fermion, ψ_α, that does transform non-trivially, seems to play the role of a Lagrange multiplier. It is possible to find another transformation, with anticommuting parameters, under which the role of the two fermions is exchanged [9, 10]:

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_2\phi = \zeta'_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta \\ &\delta_2\chi_\alpha = -\zeta'_\alpha\left(\dot\phi - F\right) \\ &\delta_2 F = \delta_2\dot\phi \\ &\delta_2\psi_\alpha = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

As [9, 10] note, it is the anticommutator of these two transformations that closes on the generator of the (Euclidian) time translations,

$$\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} = -2\zeta_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\zeta'_\beta\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} \tag{22}$$

thereby providing the justification for bestowing the name "supersymmetric" to these transformations. It is noteworthy that *which* of the two fermions we call ψ and which χ is a choice we are free to make independently, at each time instant. This can be seen to follow from the fact that we can exchange ψ and χ in the potential term exactly and, up to a total derivative, in the kinetic term, as well. We must make such a choice, since the two don't enter the transformations in the same way–but any one choice is as good as any other: this is an example of a gauge symmetry, called "$\kappa-$symmetry" [7] in this context. The action, obtained through the stochastic approach, is, thus, already, "gauge–fixed", with respect to the $\kappa-$symmetry. Let's try to understand how this is realized.

It becomes easier to apprehend what is happening, if we consider the $\psi_\alpha(\tau) \equiv \Psi_{\alpha,1}(\tau)$ and $\chi_\beta(\tau) \equiv \Psi_{\beta,2}(\tau)$ as two different "flavors", $\Psi_{\alpha,I}(\tau)$, $I = 1, 2$, in the fundamental representation of flavor $SU(2)$. Then we notice that the kinetic term

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm kinetic,f} = &\int d\tau\,\frac{1}{2}\left[-\frac{\partial\psi_\alpha}{\partial\tau}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\chi_\beta + \psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\frac{\partial\chi_\beta}{\partial\tau}\right] + \int d\tau\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\left(\frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\chi_\beta\right) = \\ &\int d\tau\,\frac{\partial\Psi_{\alpha,I}}{\partial\tau}\left[\frac{-{\rm i}\sigma_2}{2}\right]^{IJ}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Psi_{\beta,J} + \int d\tau\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\left(\frac{1}{2}\Psi_{\alpha,I}\left[\sigma_1\right]^{IJ}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Psi_{\beta,J}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Similarly, the potential term can be written as follows:

$$S_{\rm potential,f} = \int d\tau \, \frac{1}{2} \left[\psi_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \chi_\beta + \chi_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta \right] W''(\phi) = \int d\tau \, W''(\phi) \Psi_{\alpha,I} \left[\frac{\sigma_1}{2} \right]^{IJ} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{\beta,J} \tag{24}$$

We can diagonalize the kinetic term by a global, unitary, transformation in "flavor" space,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\alpha,1} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(X_{\alpha,1} + {\rm i} X_{\alpha,2} \right) \\ \Psi_{\alpha,2} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(X_{\alpha,1} - {\rm i} X_{\alpha,2} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

which, therefore, preserves the measure of the path integral. The eigenvalues, $\lambda_I = \pm {\rm i}$.Then we see that the kinetic term

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \Psi_{\alpha,I}}{\partial \tau} \left[\frac{-{\rm i}\sigma_2}{2} \right]^{IJ} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{\beta,J} = \frac{\partial \Psi_{\alpha,I}}{\partial \tau} \frac{\varepsilon^{IJ}}{2} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{\beta,J} = \frac{\partial X_{\alpha,I}}{\partial \tau} \frac{\lambda_I}{2} \delta^{IJ} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} X_{\beta,J} = \\ &\frac{1}{4} \left(\lambda^I \frac{\partial X_{\alpha,I}}{\partial \tau} \delta^{IJ} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} X_{\beta,J} + \lambda^J X_{\alpha,I} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \delta^{IJ} \frac{\partial X_{\beta,J}}{\partial \tau} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left(\frac{\rm i}{4} X_{\alpha,I} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \left[\sigma_3 \right]^{IJ} X_{\beta,J} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

becomes, indeed, a total derivative.

The potential term takes the following form under this transformation:

$$S_{\rm potential,f} = \frac{1}{4} \left(X_{\alpha,1} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} X_{\beta,1} + X_{\alpha,2} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} X_{\beta,2} \right) W''(\phi) = X_{\alpha,I} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \delta^{IJ} X_{\beta,J} \frac{W''(\phi)}{4} \tag{27}$$

Eq. (26) implies that the fermions do not propagate in the bulk, or the boundaries. It implies that only as ultra–local fermion bilinears do they contribute to the action. We can decompose the fermion bilinears in combinations of given isospin, namely an isotriplet and an isosinglet. We notice that the kinetic term and the potential term contain the $(I = 1, I_3 = \pm 1)$ combinations; the isosinglet, $I = 0$, and the $(I = 1, I_3 = 0)$ component of the triplet, i.e. two of the four fermionic fields, are "projected out" and only two are "physical".

The particle, as it propagates, creates a medium, where the "fermions" are "confined" in pairs, "dipoles". These "dipoles" don't "see" the scalar itself, $\phi(\tau)$, however, but the–generically–composite field, $W''(\phi)$. Therefore it will be the "dipoles" that will have interesting correlations, that can be probed through the correlations of $W''(\phi)$. However it is not possible to "break" the dipoles, to "deconfine" the fermions. To achieve this requires propagating "fermions", i.e. a non-trivial $\gamma-$matrix algebra, that does not exist here, where the Poincaré group consists only of time translations.

What this, also, means is that, while the "microscopic" fields are a (worldline) "scalar" and a (worldline) "fermion", components of a chiral supermultiplet, in fact the "observable" degrees of freedom are two scalars, $\phi(\tau)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(\tau) \equiv \psi_\alpha(\tau) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta(\tau)$, a bound state of the "fermion", that couples to the Polyakov loop of $W''(\phi)$ (for periodic bounder conditions; to the Wilson line for Dirichlet boundary conditions), i.e. to non–local quantities. Of course, what this statement

means is that, when $\phi(\tau)$ has local correlation functions, $\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$ has non-local ones and vice versa. This is a typical duality relation, with the $\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$ playing the role of a "disorder variable", in the context of spin models. The correlation functions of $\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$ can, indeed, be computed, from the stochastic action, as follows:

$$\langle \mathfrak{s}(\tau_0)\mathfrak{s}(\tau_1)\cdots\mathfrak{s}(\tau_{n-1})\rangle = \left\langle \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} e^{-\int d\tau\, \delta(\tau-\tau_l)\log W''(\phi(\tau))} \right\rangle \tag{28}$$

The minus sign in the exponent is crucial: it identifies the exponentials as "defects".

In other words, an insertion of the fermionic bilinear corresponds to an insertion of $\exp(-\log W''(\phi(\tau)))$ at that point. We prove this relation in appendix B. This is, of course, true if $W''(\phi) > 0$. If $W''(\phi)$ can vanish these expressions aren't well-defined. What should replace them in that case is not, yet, clear. We note that, for the quadratic superpotential, these correlation functions are all constants, which illustrates that the $\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$ is not described by a local field theory–when the $\phi(\tau)$ is.

Even though supersymmetry may be realized–the classical action is invariant and $\kappa-$symmetry is fixed–thus the "scalar" and the "fermion" are degenerate in mass, the "observable" partners $\phi(\tau)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$ are *not* degenerate in mass–the mass of $\mathfrak{s}$ is, at least, twice the mass of the "fermion". The partner exists only as a bound state of the fundamental "fermion", in a way similar to the Schwinger model. This means that, in the model under investigation, supersymmetry is realized, nevertheless the spectrum can be non–degenerate, with the "fermion" hidden in a composite particle.

The advantage of the present formalism is, first of all, that it does allow concrete calculations and, equally important, allows us to imagine experiments: ion trap technology, quantum wires and quantum dots [13] allow us to study (quantum) features of particles in ways that were not available thirty years ago.

To be able to provide specific predictions, we need to study what happens beyond the classical action, i.e. take into account field configurations that are not solutions of the equations of motion. We need to study the partition function

$$Z = \int \left[dX_{\alpha,I}(\tau)d\phi(\tau)dF(\tau)\right]\, e^{-S[\phi,F,X]} \tag{29}$$

In this expression we integrate over all possible configurations of the fermions, $X_{\alpha,I}$. In order for this expression not to vanish, we must check that, when we expand the exponential, we have enough fermionic factors from the expansion to saturate the measure. However we must, also, ensure that we're not overcounting, that we have "fixed" non-compact gauge symmetries.

Let us show how the calculation goes. The integral over the fermions factorizes over the Euclidian time, so let us present the computation for one time instant. The integral over the $X_{\alpha,I}$, at a fixed time, τ, is given by

$$Z_{\text{fermionic}} = \int dX_{\alpha,I}\, e^{\frac{W''(\phi)}{4}\left(X_{\alpha,1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,1}+X_{\alpha,2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,2}\right)} \tag{30}$$

Since the $X_{\alpha,I}$ anticommute, their ultra–local bilinears commute: $[X_{\alpha,1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,1}, X_{\alpha,2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,2}] = 0$. Therefore

$$e^{\frac{W''(\phi)}{4}\left(X_{\alpha,1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,1}+X_{\alpha,2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,2}\right)} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{W''(\phi)^l}{4^l l!}\left(X_{\alpha,1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,1}+X_{\alpha,2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,2}\right)^l = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{W''(\phi)^l}{4^l l!}\sum_{m=0}^{l}\left(\begin{array}{c} l \\ m \end{array}\right)\left(X_{\alpha,1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,1}\right)^{l-m}\left(X_{\alpha,2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,2}\right)^m \tag{31}$$

When we insert this expression in eq. (30), we remark that the terms $l = 0$ and $l = 1$ give vanishing contribution to the partition function, since the anticommuting variables of the measure are not fully paired with the anticommuting variables of the integrand. The terms $l > 2$ vanish since the $X_{\alpha,I}$ are nilpotent. The only term, therefore, that provides a non-vanishing contribution, is the term $l = 2, m = 1$. And here we see that we have a problem, since this contribution is proportional to $W''(\phi)^2$. This is the contribution of *two* fermion flavors, not one.

Indeed, we haven't projected out two anticommuting variables, among the four, i.e. one fermion. Since the measure contains four anticommuting variables–whereas the action is quadratic in these variables–the latter's expansion will contain contributions from both fermions. Fermion doubling is, thus, present, since we haven't fixed the $\kappa-$symmetry . We must include a term in the partition function, that will stop the expansion to quadratic order. We need, in the fermionic measure, a "gauge–fixing" term of the form $X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\left[\sigma^A\right]^{IJ}n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}$, that projects out the $I_3 = 0$ states. We note that this projection is the avatar of the "GSO projection" [14] in higher dimensions and recognize in the conditions

$$X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\sigma^{1,2}X_{\beta,J} = 0 \tag{32}$$

the one–dimensional avatar of the "pure spinor constraints" [15]. These hold at the level of the classical action, as we saw above. At the quantum level they imply that the "physical" correlation functions contain an insertion of this combination, i.e. are given by the expressions

$$\left[\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle\right]_{\text{physical}} = \frac{\left\langle X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\sigma^A n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}\mathcal{O}\right\rangle}{\left\langle X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\sigma^A n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}\right\rangle} \tag{33}$$

where the expectation values of the RHS are evaluated from the partition function (29). This should imply that the σ^A that enter these expressions are the identity and σ^3. As we shall see below this expression is well defined because neither denominator nor numerator vanish identically.

This equation is a *definition* of the LHS and raises the question of the partition function that can compute it. Of course the constraint (32) is not "covariant", in the following sense: since it projects out one "fermion", it, actually, picks out a direction of time. Indeed, the Langevin equation is a dissipative equation, while quantum evolution is invariant under time-reversal. That is the reason a second "fermion" is required for manifest supersymmetry, to introduce

the time reversed dynamics [10]. In a relativistic setting the two "fermions" would be each other's antiparticle, thereby realizing Feynman's picture of antiparticles as particles evolving "backwards" in time. The non-relativistic setting, where the action is invariant only under time translations, breaks the relation particle/antiparticle and, thus, singles out one time direction, controlled by each "fermion" separately-along each direction, the "other fermion" imposes a constraint.

How this choice can be introduced in the action in a covariant way is a non-trivial and, still, not fully solved problem [15]. If we take it at face value in the present context, we remark that the RHS of eq. (33) can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\left\langle X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\sigma^A n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}\mathcal{O}\right\rangle}{\left\langle X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\sigma^A n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}\right\rangle} &= Z^{-1}_{\text{gauge fixed}}\int [dX_{\alpha,I}d\phi dF]\, X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\sigma^A n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}\mathcal{O}\times \\ e^{-\int d\tau\left[-\frac{F^2}{2}+F\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau}+W'(\phi)\right)\right]}&\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{W''(\phi)^l}{4^l l!}\sum_{m=0}^{l}\left(\begin{array}{c} l \\ m\end{array}\right)\left(X_{\alpha,1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,1}\right)^{l-m}\left(X_{\alpha,2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,2}\right)^m\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}Z_{\text{gauge fixed}} = \int [dX_{\alpha,I}d\phi dF]\; X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\sigma^A n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}e^{-\int d\tau\left(-\frac{F^2}{2}+F\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau}+W'(\phi)\right)\right)}\times \\ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{W''(\phi)^l}{4^l l!}\sum_{m=0}^{l}\left(\begin{array}{c} l \\ m\end{array}\right)\left(X_{\alpha,1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,1}\right)^{l-m}\left(X_{\alpha,2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}X_{\beta,2}\right)^m\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

This time the sums stop at $l = 1$, thanks to the presence of the $X_{\alpha,I}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\left[\sigma^A\right]^{IJ}n^B\delta^{AB}X_{\beta,J}$. In fact, from the structure of the terms in (30), we realize that, only if $\sigma^A = I$ or $\sigma^A = \sigma^3$, will we obtain a non-zero expression to integrate over the $X_{\alpha,I}$ at all, thereby confirming our expectation. The result of this calculation is, therefore, that $Z_{\text{gauge fixed}}$ is given by the following expression:

$$Z_{\text{gauge fixed}} = 2(n^0+n^3)\int [d\phi dF]\left(\prod_{n=0}^{N-1}W''(\phi_n)\right)e^{-\int d\tau\left[-\frac{F^2}{2}+F\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau}+W'(\phi)\right)\right]} \tag{36}$$

since the $X_{\alpha,I}$ are ultra–local. As long as $n^0+n^3 \neq 0$, this expression does not vanish identically[2]. The product is, of course, a shorthand for the continuum path ordered product and anticipates the lattice regularization that will be discussed in the next section.

We may now introduce it in the action using anticommuting variables,

$$\begin{aligned}W''(\phi(\tau)) &= \int d\psi_1(\tau)d\psi_2(\tau)\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}W''(\phi)\psi_\beta(\tau)} \Rightarrow \\ \prod_{n=0}^{N-1}W''(\phi_n) &= \int [d\psi_\alpha(\tau)]\, e^{\int d\tau\frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}W''(\phi(\tau))\psi_\beta(\tau)}\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

[2]Of course this, simply, illustrates the non-covariance of this gauge choice-using the "other fermion", we would have found the expression $n^0 - n^3$. These expressions illustrate the choice of the time direction.

and recover the partition function of eq. (6)–without the kinetic term for the "fermion".

Within this class of gauges, the correlation functions, computed by the two partition functions, are the same, so these describe the same physics. To understand what this physics is and whether it is affected by the gauge–fixing procedure we must compute relations between correlation functions that express supersymmetry. Such relations exist between the correlation functions of the auxiliary field,

$$F(\tau) \equiv \frac{d\phi}{d\tau} + W'(\phi(\tau)) \tag{38}$$

and are expressed by Wick's theorem, since it's supposed to be a Gaussian field. More precisely the 1–point function should vanish, the 2–point function should be ultra–local and all higher, connected, correlation functions should vanish. To do the computation we shall use a lattice regularization, for computational and conceptual reasons: Computational, because we have to evaluate integrals over many variables and conceptual because we are not limited to perturbation theory. On the other hand, we can show how perturbation theory fits in the calculation.

It is very easy to prove that the 1–point function, $\langle F(\tau)\rangle$, vanishes. To prove that the other correlation functions of the auxiliary field do satisfy Wick's theorem, we seem to have a problem. The reason is the following;

We may integrate out the fermions and the auxiliary field and write the partition function as follows:

$$Z = \int [d\phi(\tau)] \left(\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left|\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi_n^2}\right|\right) e^{-\int d\tau \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau}+\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}\right)^2} = Z_0 \left\langle \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left|\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi_n^2}\right| \right\rangle_0 \tag{39}$$

where

$$Z_0 \equiv \int [d\phi(\tau)]\ e^{-\int d\tau \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau}+\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}\right)^2} \tag{40}$$

and $\langle\cdot\rangle_0$ denotes the average with respect to Z_0. We have anticipated the use of a lattice regularization to write the infinite product we obtain when we integrate out the fermions. What this term amounts to is the "Polyakov loop" of $W''(\phi)$.

The correlation functions with respect to the partition function, Z, can, therefore, be expressed as the ratios

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{\left\langle \left(\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left|\frac{\partial^2 W(\phi_n)}{\partial \phi^2}\right|\right) \mathcal{O} \right\rangle_0}{\left\langle \left(\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left|\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi^2}\right|\right) \right\rangle_0} \tag{41}$$

These expressions reduce to those derived in ref. [1], if we consider uniform configurations, $\phi(\tau) \equiv \phi$, for the scalar. The product contributes ultra–local terms in the action, namely $a\sum_n \log|W''(\phi_n)|$–if we assume (as we do) that $W''(\phi)$ can never vanish. In fact it is better to write this as $\sum_n \log|aW''(\phi_n)|$, which is obtained by replacing the integral by a sum before integrating out the fermions. If $W''(\phi_n)$ can vanish, then we must introduce a regularization and take into account the sign of the Polyakov loop. The effective action for the scalar must

be reconstructed from the correlation functions, defined by the insertion of this regularized product ([1] for the zero–dimensional case).

If $W''(\phi) > 0$ for all field configurations, however, we can include the Polyakov loop in the action, since it makes an ultra–local contribution and compute $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle$ by sampling with respect to Z and not Z_0. This we shall do for the case studied in the present paper.

However, we remark that there seems to be an obstruction: If we perform the change of variables from the scalar, $\phi(\tau)$, to the auxiliary field, $F(\tau)$, we find that Z is, apparently, given by the following expression

$$Z = \int [dF(\tau)] \frac{\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} W''(\phi(F(\tau_n))}{\det\left(\frac{d}{d\tau} + W''(\phi(F(\tau)))\right)} e^{-\int d\tau \frac{1}{2} F^2} \tag{42}$$

Not only does it seems difficult to prove that the ratio is equal to 1–it, actually, seems impossible. This would be fatal, not only, to the realization of supersymmetry, since it would imply that the auxiliary field wouldn't have an ultra–local 2–point function and, thus, would be a ghost, but, also, for the consistency of the theory, since the ghost would not decouple and the theory could only be defined in the presence of a cutoff procedure and be sensitive to the details thereof.

Indeed, while the ratio, as written, cannot be equal to 1, it is, in fact, equal to 1, up to a surface term contribution. The reason is that the contribution of the operator $d/d\tau$ is a total derivative. So we realize that, formally, at least,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} W''(\phi(\tau_n)) = \int [d\psi_\alpha(\tau)]\, e^{\int d\tau \frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}W''(\phi(\tau))\psi_\beta(\tau)} \\
&\det\left(\frac{d}{d\tau} + W''(\phi(\tau))\right) = \int [d\psi_\alpha(\tau)]\, e^{\int d\tau \frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\left(\frac{d}{d\tau}\psi_\beta + W''(\phi(\tau))\psi_\beta\right)} = \\
&\qquad \int [d\psi_\alpha(\tau)] e^{\frac{1}{2}\left[\psi_\alpha(T)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(T) - \psi_\alpha(0)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(0)\right]} \times e^{\int d\tau \frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}W''(\phi)\psi_\beta(\tau)}
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

We note that with (anti)periodic boundary conditions for the "fermions", $\psi_\alpha(T) = \pm\psi_\alpha(0)$, the bilinears, $\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)$ satisfy periodic boundary conditions, $\psi_\alpha(T)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(T) = \psi_\alpha(0)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(0)$,, so, formally, we have an equality. As long as $W''(\phi)$ is of fixed sign, these expressions should make sense.

In the next section we shall regularize the partition function, in order to evaluate the correlation functions of the auxiliary field and compute the identities they should satisfy, that stem from Wick's theorem. To compute the averages without recourse to perturbation theory, we shall use a lattice regularization and use Monte Carlo methods to sample the configuration space.

The new, technical, feature with respect to the zero–dimensional case is that, since the scalar can propagate in the bulk, we must compute an $N-$dimensional integral, instead of a one–dimensional one, so we must use Monte Carlo methods to sample it.

3 Beyond the classical action: the correlation functions of the auxiliary field

3.1 The lattice setup

We introduce an infrared cutoff, $0 \leq \tau \leq T$, and an ultraviolet cutoff, $a = T/N$, $\tau \equiv n \cdot a$, $0 \leq n \leq N$. We shall impose periodic boundary conditions on the scalar.

Replacing the derivatives by finite differences, we write the scalar action (having dropped the total derivative, thanks to the boundary conditions)

$$S[\phi] = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 - \log W''(\phi) \right] = \int d\tau \left[-\frac{1}{2} \phi \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} \phi + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 - \log W''(\phi) \right] \tag{44}$$

as follows:

$$S[\phi] = a \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[-\phi_n \frac{\phi_{n+1} - 2\phi_n + \phi_{n-1}}{2a^2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_n} \right)^2 - \log W''(\phi_n) \right] \tag{45}$$

The superpotential, $W(\phi_n)$, we shall consider will be the quartic superpotential,

$$W(\phi_n) = \frac{m^2}{2} \phi_n^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!} \phi_n^4 \tag{46}$$

with $m^2 > 0, \lambda > 0$, so that $W'' > 0$ thereby avoiding having to deal with fermionic zeromodes. Let us define the lattice parameters

$$\varphi_n \equiv a^{-1/2} \phi_n, \quad m_{\text{latt}}^2 \equiv m^2 a, \quad \lambda_{\text{latt}} \equiv \lambda a^2 \tag{47}$$

in terms of which the lattice action becomes

$$S_{\text{latt}}[\varphi] = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[-\varphi_n \varphi_{n+1} + \varphi_n^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(m_{\text{latt}}^2 \varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\text{latt}}}{6} \varphi_n^3 \right)^2 - a \log \left(m_{\text{latt}}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\text{latt}}}{2} \varphi_n^2 \right) + a \log\, a \right] \tag{48}$$

This expression is interesting for several reasons:

- We remark that the term

$$S_{\text{Polyakov}}[\varphi] = -a \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[\log \left(m_{\text{latt}}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\text{latt}}}{2} \varphi_n^2 \right) - \log\, a \right] \tag{49}$$

  seems to be an "irrelevant" term, since it is proportional to the lattice spacing, after rescaling. It would, indeed, be irrelevant, if there weren't any correlation functions, in which it could contribute, that were linearly divergent. Such correlation functions do exist, however, namely those that involve energy fluctuations and express the time–energy uncertainty relation.

- The "classical" potential on the lattice,

$$V(\varphi_n) = \varphi_n^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(m_{\rm latt}^2\varphi_n + \lambda_{\rm latt}\frac{\varphi_n^3}{6}\right)^2 \tag{50}$$

has its, unique, minimum at $\varphi_n = 0$. The first term is a contribution from the kinetic term.

For uniform configurations, $\varphi_n = \varphi$, we might have expected that the "Polyakov loop term" provides the Jacobian for the change of variables to the Gaussian integral:

$$\int \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} d\varphi_n\, e^{-S_{\rm latt}[\varphi_n=\varphi]} \stackrel{?}{=} \int \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} dW'(\varphi_n)\, e^{-\frac{W'(\varphi_n)^2}{2}} \tag{51}$$

and we see that we've been, somewhat, careless with the lattice action. We should take more care with the rescaling of the lattice spacing.

Let us, therefore, recall that the "Polyakov loop term" originated from integrating out Grassmann variables:

$$\int [d\psi_\alpha(\tau)]\, e^{\int d\tau\, \frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)W''(\phi)} = \int \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} d\psi_{\alpha,n}\, e^{a\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{1}{2}\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\beta,n}W''(\phi_n)} \tag{52}$$

This expression suggests that we should absorb the lattice spacing in $W''(\phi_n)$ and write the above expression as

$$\int \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} d\psi_{\alpha,n}\, e^{\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{1}{2}\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\beta,n}aW''(\phi_n)} = \prod_{n=0}^{N-1}(aW''(\phi_n)) = \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} W''(\varphi_n; m_{\rm latt}^2, \lambda_{\rm latt}) \tag{53}$$

where

$$W''(\varphi; m_{\rm latt}^2, \lambda_{\rm latt}) = m_{\rm latt}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{2}\varphi_n^2 \tag{54}$$

Introducing this term in the action, we obtain the following expression

$$S_{\rm latt}[\varphi_n] = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left[-\varphi_n\varphi_{n+1} + \varphi_n^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(m_{\rm latt}^2\varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{6}\varphi_n^3\right)^2 - \log\left(m_{\rm latt}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{2}\varphi_n^2\right)\right] \tag{55}$$

that does have the correct uniform limit.

We remark that

$$g \equiv \frac{\lambda}{m^4} = \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{m_{\rm latt}^4} \tag{56}$$

This combination, which vanishes for vanishing coupling constant, therefore can be taken as an effective measure of its strength, is scale invariant. On the other hand, the ratio

$$s \equiv \frac{m^2}{\lambda} = a\frac{m^2_{\rm latt}}{\lambda_{\rm latt}} \tag{57}$$

provides a good definition of a length scale. The scaling limit may thus be defined by taking the ratio $m^2_{\rm latt}/\lambda_{\rm latt} \to \infty$, as the lattice spacing $a \to 0$ and the lattice size, $N \to \infty$, keeping the ratio m^2/λ fixed. The ratio $g \equiv \lambda/m^4$ is arbitrary–if it's less than 1, the theory is weakly coupled, if it's greater than, or of order 1, the theory is strongly coupled. We remark that the case $s = 0$ requires special care and we defer its study.

Of course these statements are "classical", since they don't take into account the dynamics–this is just dimensional analysis. What we should do, to check that these statements are, indeed, consistent with the dynamics, is to express $m^2_{\rm latt}$ and $\lambda_{\rm latt}$ in terms of correlation functions of the lattice theory, using the Schwinger–Dyson equations [3]

$$\int [d\varphi_n] \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_j} \left(\varphi_{n_1} \varphi_{n_2} \cdots \varphi_{n_K} \, e^{-S_{\rm latt}[\varphi]} \right) = 0 \tag{58}$$

and Monte Carlo renormalization group (MCRG) techniques [16] to compute their flow. The main obstacle here is storage of the configurations necessary to compute the correlation functions. This was the main reason why this method was not pursued in the eighties. Once gigabyte (and, now, terabyte) storage media became available, this method can become, once more, effective, beyond the technological limitations of the past.

The details and results of such calculations will be reported in future work. For the model at hand, in any case, we do not expect that this, more refined, analysis, will bring forth something new, because the "divergence" structure of this model is "straightforward": it is a quantum field theory, in one spacetime dimension, so, usually, normal ordering would be sufficient. Here the worldline supersymmetry enforces this automatically. Let us perform one more rescaling, that will prove useful:

$$\varphi_n = \left(\frac{m^2_{\rm latt}}{\lambda_{\rm latt}} \right)^{1/2} \Phi_n \tag{59}$$

The lattice mass, $m^2_{\rm latt}$ can be expressed in terms of the scale invariant coupling and the lattice size and spacing as follows:

$$m^2_{\rm latt} = \frac{1}{g(N/L)(m^2/\lambda)} = \frac{a}{gs} \tag{60}$$

The lattice coupling, $\lambda_{\rm latt}$, in turn, is given by

$$\lambda_{\rm latt} = g m^4_{\rm latt} = \frac{a^2}{gs^2} \tag{61}$$

This means that the scaling limit consists in sending $m^2_{\rm latt} \to 0$ and $\lambda_{\rm latt} \to 0$ while keeping $\lambda_{\rm latt}/m^4_{\rm latt}$ fixed and the scale, s, fixed.

In this way we obtain the following expression for the lattice action,

$$S_{\rm latt} = \frac{1}{m_{\rm latt}^2 g} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[-\Phi_n \Phi_{n+1} + \Phi_n^2 + \frac{m_{\rm latt}^4}{2} \left(\Phi_n + \frac{1}{6} \Phi_n^3 \right)^2 \right] \tag{62}$$

To this expression we should add the contribution of the Polyakov loop,

$$S_{\rm Polyakov} = - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log \left[m_{\rm latt}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\Phi_n^2}{2} \right) \right] \tag{63}$$

Since it gives an ultra–local contribution to the action, it is much more efficient to include it in the action to be sampled rather than include it in the correlator, that must be recomputed after each update.

$S_{\rm latt} + S_{\rm Polyakov}$, where the terms are given by eqs. (62) and (63), is the expression of the action, that seems best suited for numerical work. We remark that the scale, s, does not appear explicitly: It is "hidden" in the definition of the "lattice field", Φ_n (and the lattice mass, $m_{\rm latt}^2$).

The observable we shall concentrate on is the auxiliary field, appropriately rescaled. Recall that, in the continuum, it is given by its equation of motion:

$$F = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi(\tau)} \tag{64}$$

On the lattice the corresponding quantity would read

$$\begin{aligned} & F_n = \frac{\phi_{n+1} - \phi_{n-1}}{2a} + m^2 \phi_n + \frac{\lambda}{6} \phi_n^3 = \frac{\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_{n-1}}{2a^{1/2}} + m_{\rm latt}^2 a^{-1/2} \varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{6} a^{-1/2} \varphi_n^3 \Rightarrow \\ & a^{1/2} F_n \equiv \mathcal{F}_n = \frac{1}{2} \left(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_{n-1} \right) + m_{\rm latt}^2 \varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{6} \varphi_n^3 \Rightarrow \\ & \left(\frac{m_{\rm latt}^2}{\lambda_{\rm latt}} \right)^{-1/2} \mathcal{F}_n \equiv \mathfrak{F}_n = \frac{1}{2} \left(\Phi_{n+1} - \Phi_{n-1} \right) + m_{\rm latt}^2 \left(\Phi_n + \frac{\Phi_n^3}{6} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

We see immediately that $\langle \mathfrak{F}_n \rangle = 0$ is preserved by the lattice regularization. Let us now write the partition function in terms of the auxiliary field, in order to understand, whether the lattice regularization respects the stochastic identities.

The partition function, at finite lattice spacing and lattice size, takes the following form

$$Z_{\rm latt} = \int \left[\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} d\varphi_n \left(m_{\rm latt}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{2} \varphi_n^2 \right) \right] \; e^{-\sum \left[-\varphi_n \varphi_{n+1} + \varphi_n^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(m_{\rm latt}^2 \varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{6} \varphi_n^3 \right)^2 \right]} \tag{66}$$

We would like to show that, up to terms that vanish in the limit of vanishing lattice spacing, the expression in the exponent is a perfect square, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} & -\varphi_n \varphi_{n+1} + \varphi_n^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(m_{\rm latt}^2 \varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{6} \varphi_n^3 \right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \right)^2 + \left(m_{\rm latt}^2 \varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{6} \varphi_n^3 \right)^2 \right) = \\ & \frac{1}{2} \left(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n + m_{\rm latt}^2 \varphi_n + \frac{\lambda_{\rm latt}}{6} \varphi_n^3 \right)^2 - \left(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \right) W'(\varphi_n; m_{\rm latt}^2, \lambda_{\rm latt}) \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

If we expand the last term in powers of the lattice spacing we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&(\varphi_{n+1}-\varphi_n)\,W'(\varphi_n;m^2_{\rm latt},\lambda_{\rm latt})=\\&a\frac{d}{d\tau}W(\varphi_n;m^2_{\rm latt},\lambda_{\rm latt})+\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{a^{2m+1}}{(2m+1)!}\left[\frac{d}{d\tau}\left(\frac{d^{2m}\varphi}{d\tau^{2m}}W'\right)-\frac{d^{2m}\varphi}{d\tau^{2m}}\frac{d}{d\tau}W'\right]\end{aligned}\tag{68}$$

The superpotential, $W(\varphi_n;m^2_{\rm latt},\lambda_{\rm latt})$, has a smooth limit, as $a\to 0$, so does not cancel the explicit lattice spacing factor:

$$W(\varphi_n;m^2_{\rm latt},\lambda_{\rm latt})=\frac{1}{2}(m^2a)a^{-1}\phi_n^2+\frac{1}{4!}(\lambda a^2)a^{-2}\phi_n^4=W(\phi_n,m^2,\lambda)\tag{69}$$

Of course, at this point, this is an assumption, which we shall test by our simulations. We expect it to hold for the theory we are studying, of course.

We remark that the $O(a)$ term is, apparently, a surface term and the higher order terms are a sum of surface terms and terms that vanish in the limit of vanishing lattice spacing, provided the series converges. Assuming that their contribution in correlation functions is not cancelled by a linear divergence, they may, thus, be neglected, in the continuum limit. Their presence expresses how supersymmetry is broken by the lattice regularization.

We should keep in mind, however, that, when we wrote down the lattice action, upon discretizing the kinetic term for the scalar,

$$\phi\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}\phi\approx\phi_n\frac{\phi_{n+1}-2\phi_n+\phi_{n-1}}{a^2}\tag{70}$$

we kept a subset of all possible terms in the Taylor expansion and have assumed that the terms neglected, proportional to higher powers of the lattice spacing, do not, in fact, give rise to finite contributions, when inserted in correlation functions. Since we have neglected those, we cannot, *a priori*, distinguish their contribution from that of the terms neglected here. Therefore it is consistent to neglect these, too.

The lattice calculation of the correlation functions will allow us to test these assumptions. It might, therefore, be useful to investigate whether "perfect lattice actions" [20] could be written for this case, that could reduce the systematic errors. (Of course these do not eliminate possible non-analytic dependence on the lattice spacing. But such singularities reflect physical effects, like phase transitions, that herald the appearance of new degrees of freedom.)

Of course corresponding expressions are obtained if we work with the rescaled lattice field, Φ_n, instead of φ_n.

There remains the Jacobian of the transformation, whose contribution, we wish to show, is cancelled by the product over $W''(\varphi_n;m^2_{\rm latt},\lambda_{\rm latt})$.

The idea is to implement the lattice version of eq. (43), namely that

$$\det\frac{\partial\mathfrak{F}_n}{\partial\Phi_m}=\prod_{n=0}^{N-1}W''(\Phi_n)\tag{71}$$

up to surface terms. The proof of this statement goes as follows:

The left–hand–side may be exponentiated, using anticommuting variables:

$$\det \frac{\partial \mathfrak{F}_n}{\partial \Phi_m} = \int \left[\prod_{l=0}^{N-1} d\psi_{\alpha,l} \right] e^{\frac{1}{2}\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{F}_n}{\partial \Phi_m}\psi_{\beta,m}} \tag{72}$$

The expression in the exponent is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{F}_n}{\partial \Phi_m}\psi_{\beta,m} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n,m}\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\left(\frac{\delta_{n+1,m}-\delta_{n-1,m}}{2} + W''(\Phi)\delta_{n,m}\right)\psi_{\beta,m} = \\ &\frac{1}{4}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left[\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\beta,n+1} - \psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\beta,n-1}\right] + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\beta,n}W''(\Phi_n) \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

The first sum does leave behind a surface term, since $\psi_{\alpha,n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\beta,n-1} = \psi_{\alpha,n-1}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\beta,n}$.

Therefore, we conclude that the partition function, up to irrelevant terms, is, indeed, given by a product of Gaussian integrals over the auxiliary field and, assuming the irrelevant terms remain irrelevant, the lattice action, in terms of the auxiliary field, does respect the stochastic identities.

Let us, finally, note the following fact: For a finite system, the lattice action is defined up to an additive constant. Such a contribution will not affect the value of any correlation function, since it cancels in the ratio. Furthermore, we remark that the value of the parameter m^2_{latt}, that enters eq. (63), can be rescaled by an arbitrary, finite, constant. Such a rescaling will only give rise, precisely, to an additive contribution to the action and, thus, will be completely invisible to any correlation function. Therefore the vacuum energy remains undefined, even though the partition function can be written as a Gaussian integral. The correct statement is that this constant is independent of the field configuration: "fermions" and "bosons" make equal contributions to its value. Conversely, if m^2_{latt}, in the term, $\log W''$, does not have the same value as the m^2_{latt}, that multiplies W'^2, by adding an appropriate constant to the action, that cannot contribute to any correlation function, we can make it take the same value. Once more, this is due to the fact that the anticommuting variables do not propagate individually, but contribute an ultra–local term, of fixed sign.

In section 4 we discuss how to relate the correlation functions of the auxiliary field to those of the scalar in practice–and test the assumption that the, neglected, irrelevant terms, do not contribute to linearly divergent correlation functions.

Before we do that, let us discuss how to set up the calculation, when fermionic zeromodes are present.

3.2 In presence of fermionic zeromodes

If $W''(\phi_n) = 0$ does have real roots, we have the following problem: The (classical) effective potential, in the continuum,

$$V[\phi(\tau)]_{\text{cont}} = \frac{1}{2}\left(W'(\phi)\right)^2 - \log|W''(\phi)| \tag{74}$$

or on the lattice,

$$V[\phi_n]_{\rm latt} = \phi_n^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(W'(\phi_n)\right)^2 - \log|W''(\phi_n)| \tag{75}$$

(if we include the explicit quadratic contribution from the kinetic term) displays infinitely high barriers at the roots of $|W''(\phi_n)| = 0$. Therefore the configuration space seems to split into disconnected components–ergodicity is, apparently, broken and so is supersymmetry, since configurations, with ϕ_n on the other side of the barrier than the minimum, can never be connected to configurations in the same well as the minimum.

The infinite barriers at finite field values are the signal that this expression may be misleading–since they would imply symmetry breaking in one dimension [21]. This occurs if there appear degrees of freedom, with long range interactions. These will be dual to the velocity, as we shall see presently.

For there is the following ambiguity: When we attempt to express the Jacobian as an integral over Grassmann variables, if the Jacobian can vanish, then the integral over the Grassmann variables is ill–defined, since the integration volume is infinite and the integrand has flat directions.

So we cannot draw the conclusion of the preceding paragraphs, without, first, having regularized this ambiguity.

The idea–which isn't, specifically, tailored to the case where $W''(\Phi) = 0$ has real roots, in fact–is the following: In the partition function,

$$Z = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[d\Phi_n\,|W''(\Phi_n)|\right]\, e^{-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\Phi_{n+1}-\Phi_{n-1}}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{g_2^2}{2}(W'(\Phi_n))^2\right]} \tag{76}$$

we use a Hubbard–Stratonovich transformation, through which we introduced the auxiliary field in eq. (10), to linearize the kinetic term:

$$e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\Phi_{n+1}-\Phi_{n-1}}{2}\right)^2} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dp_n}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, e^{-\frac{p_n^2}{2} + {\rm i}p_n\frac{\Phi_{n+1}-\Phi_{n-1}}{2}} \tag{77}$$

The $\{p_n\}$ variables, dual to the $(\Phi_{n+1} - \Phi_{n-1})/2$, through this transform, live, therefore, on the sites of the "dual lattice", between site $n-1$ and site $n+1$ of the original one.

If we have imposed periodic boundary conditions, then

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} p_n\left(\Phi_{n+1} - \Phi_{n-1}\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \Phi_n\left(p_{n+1} - p_{n-1}\right) \tag{78}$$

up to a surface term, that vanishes by the boundary conditions.

Therefore, the integral over Φ_n factorizes over the scalar field at the sites. The partition function is given, then, by the following expression

$$Z = Z_\Phi \int \left[\frac{dp_n}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right]\, e^{-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\frac{p_n^2}{2}} \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left\langle e^{{\rm i}\Phi_n\left(\frac{p_{n+1}-p_{n-1}}{2}\right)}\right\rangle_\Phi \tag{79}$$

The average value is with respect to the zero–dimensional partition function, over each site, that was studied in ref. [1] and Z_Φ is their product:

$$Z_\Phi \equiv \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \int d\Phi_n \, |W''(\Phi_n)| \, e^{-\frac{g_2^2}{2}(W'(\Phi_n))^2} \tag{80}$$

so the effect of the kinetic term is expressed by the integral over the p_n. If the average value in this integral is equal to 1, then the partition function reduces to that over independent sites.

These expressions seem to indicate that the variables, that are the most useful, when kinetic coupling of single-site distributions is present, are the $\{p_n\}$, variables that live on the dual lattice and not the $\{\Phi_n\}$ variables, that live on the sites of the original lattice.

To confirm this expectation, we must show that the average value in eq. (79) is real and positive.

That it is real, is easy to show, since the domain of integration is symmetric about the origin and the rest of the integrand is positive and symmetric too (in technical terms the integrand enjoys reflection positivity).

That it is positive is a bit more involved–it's a consequence of Bochner's theorem [8]: For we can consider $\langle \exp(\mathrm{i}\Phi_n(p_{n+1}-p_{n-1})/(2))\rangle$ as, *either* the expectation value of the exponential, *or* the Fourier transform of the measure, $d\mu(\Phi) \equiv d\Phi_n \, |W''(\Phi_n)| \exp(-W'(\Phi_n)^2/2)$. Then we must show that the "matrix" , $f_{k,l} = \langle e^{\mathrm{i}\Phi_k\left(\frac{p_k-p_l}{2g_1}\right)}\rangle_\Phi$ is Hermitian. Formally this follows from the fact that the measure $d\mu(\Phi)$ is non-negative.

So there isn't a "sign problem" here–the partition function is non-negative and the average value can be, in principle, computed, using the measure $d\mu(\Phi)$-which is a single-site measure.

The issue that arises, if $W''(\Phi)$ has real roots, is that we cannot use $d\mu(\Phi)$, as defined, to compute the moments, in particular $\langle \exp(\mathrm{i}\Phi_n(p_{n+1}-p_{n-1})/(2))\rangle$, due to the infinitely high barriers at the roots of $W''(\Phi)$. In this case the "sign problem" is, simply, a consequence of the fact that we are not using the correct measure for sampling.

Therefore, in this, latter, case, we must reconstruct the "true" measure" from its moments [1], for which Bochner's theorem then will apply. How this calculation can be carried out efficiently will be reported in future work. Indeed, Bochner's theorem contains an additional assumption on the measure, $d\mu(\Phi)$, that it be non–decreasing. It is this assumption that does not hold, for the measure $|W''(\Phi)| \exp(-g_2 W'(\phi)^2/2)d\Phi$, when $W''(\Phi)$ can vanish. In any case the procedure presented in ref. [1] is constructive.

The "sign problem" might appear, if $\langle\Phi_n\rangle \neq 0$. Then we remark that, apparently, $\langle \exp(\mathrm{i}(p_{n+1}-p_{n-1})\Phi_n/2\rangle$, is not real. Let's see how this issue can be resolved.

If we write $\Phi_n \equiv u_n + \langle\Phi\rangle$, we would find that

$$\langle \exp(\mathrm{i}(u_n+\langle\Phi\rangle)(p_{n+1}-p_{n-1})/2)\rangle_\Phi = \exp(\mathrm{i}\langle\Phi\rangle(p_{n+1}-p_{n-1})/2)\,\langle \exp(\mathrm{i}u_n(p_{n+1}-p_{n-1})/2)\rangle_u \tag{81}$$

Periodic boundary conditions imply that the term involving $\langle\Phi\rangle$ does not contribute to the action of the $\{p_n\}$, since the sum over p_{n+1} cancels the sum over p_{n-1} as $\langle\Phi\rangle$ does not depend

on the site. The average over the $\{u_n\}$ will be real and positive if the distribution, centered at $\Phi_n = \langle\Phi\rangle \Leftrightarrow \langle u_n\rangle = 0$, is symmetric about the average, i.e. if the centered moments of odd order vanish. For the Gaussian this is obvious. For the cubic superpotential it isn't that obvious and we prove it in appendix C.

Eq. (79) is, thus, a *definition* of the partition function, when the *classical* potential has multiple minima. Whether it is a *correct* definition can be tested: we can compute the correlation functions using a lattice regularization of the original classical action and check that we get the same results. This requires a detailed analysis that will be presented in forthcoming work. It passes the basic consistency check of reproducing the expression for the partition function, for the case that $W''[\Phi] > 0$ always, by construction.

In eq. (79) $\{p_n\}$ label the *position* in the dual system–whereas their "dual variables", $(\Phi_{n+1} - \Phi_{n-1})/2$,, label the *velocity* in the original system. Therefore $dp_n/d\tau$ is the *velocity* of the dual system–and the force (per unit mass) in the original system. The physical meaning of the condition that $\langle\exp(\mathrm{i}\Phi_n((p_{n+1}-p_{n-1})/(2))\rangle = 1$, which implies that $Z = 1$, is that the (average) velocity, $dp/d\tau$, is constant, so the dual system describes a free particle. For the original system it means that the force is constant. This is the expression, in this context, of the well-known criteria for supersymmetry breaking [12].

We deduce that, if these conditions do not hold, then supersymmetry will be broken–and they express what this breaking means: that the dual variables do not describe a free particle.

For, in order to reconstruct the probability density of the $\{\Phi_n\}$ it is necessary to compute, not only the correlation functions of the ultra–local quantities, $\Phi_n^{q_k}$, $\langle\Phi_{n_1}^{q_1}\cdots\Phi_{n_k}^{q_k}\rangle$, but to take, also, into account the insertion and the correlation functions of the kinetic terms, expressed, here in terms of the $\{p_n\}$, dual variables.

What remains to be understood is how the duality transformation, between the $\{p_n\}$ variables and the $\{\Phi_n\}$ variables is, explicitly, realized at the level of correlation functions. From eq. (79) we obtain the correlation functions, $\langle p_{n_1}p_{n_2}\cdots p_{n_k}\rangle$, of the $\{p_n\}$ variables. From the definition (77) we realize that the $\{p_n\}$ are the Fourier transforms of $(\Phi_{n+1} - \Phi_{n-1})/(2)$.

How these insights can translate readily to computationally efficient code remains to be seen. A possible strategy, however, can be the following: To generate configurations $\{\Phi_n\}$, using the scalar action and, from them, to compute the identities that should be satisfied by $\mathfrak{F}_n$. For, as we recall in appendix A, the loop expansion of the scalar action is encoded in the expansion of the Polyakov loop. So by computing the correlation functions of the auxiliary field by Monte Carlo simulations, we are taking into account configurations that are, in fact, sensitive to the effects encoded by the loop expansion and, eventually, beyond it, since the correlation functions, sampled from the lattice action, close to the scaling limit, are expected to encode the properties of the true measure in the space of field configurations. To test, whether this measure is, indeed, supersymmetric, it suffices to compute the identities that express Wick's theorem for the auxiliary field.

In the next section we, therefore, return to the case of the quartic superpotential with a single minimum and test the formalism that was developed in section 3.1. In this way we shall understand much better, why it's not easy to detect worldline supersymmetry in quantum

mechanics.

4 Numerical results

We use a standard Metropolis algorithm to generate configurations and compute the correlation functions. We tune the parameters so that the acceptance rate is, at least, 70%. (If it's too high, the configurations are too correlated, if it's too low they are too few.) We would like to take $m^2_{\rm latt} \to 0$, as $N \to \infty$, at fixed $g \equiv \lambda_{\rm latt}/m^4_{\rm latt}$ and fixed scale $s \equiv m^2/\lambda = \lim_{a\to 0}(a(m^2_{\rm latt}/\lambda_{\rm latt}))$. In practice, therefore, we shall retain $m^2_{\rm latt}$, N and g as our parameters.

For the "Polyakov loop term",

$$\log\left[m^2_{\rm latt}\left(1+\frac{\Phi^2_n}{2}\right)\right] = \log C m_{\rm latt} + \log\left[\frac{m_{\rm latt}}{C}\left(1+\frac{\Phi^2_n}{2}\right)\right] \tag{82}$$

we remark that we can eliminate its–explicit–dependence on the value of $m^2_{\rm latt}$, by choosing $C = m_{\rm latt}$. By choosing some other, positive, value of C, we will not affect the physics, since the term $\log C m_{\rm latt}$ will not affect any Monte Carlo update (we used this freedom in the simulations reported in ref. [17]). This ambiguity, of course, reflects the fact that the "fermion" is in a bound state, therefore its mass is not well–defined.

If we compute the variation, $\delta S[\Phi_n] \equiv S[\Phi_n + \delta\Phi_n] - S[\Phi_n]$, of the full lattice action, when we attempt the update $\Phi_n \to \Phi_n + \delta\Phi_n$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}&\delta S[\Phi_n] = \\ &\frac{1}{m^2_{\rm latt} g}\left(-\delta\Phi_n\left(\Phi_{n+1}+\Phi_{n-1}\right) + \delta\Phi_n\left(2\Phi_n+\delta\Phi_n\right) + \frac{m^4_{\rm latt}}{2}\left(W'(\Phi_n+\delta\Phi_n)^2 - W'(\Phi_n)^2\right)\right) \\ &- \log\frac{W''(\Phi_n+\delta\Phi_n)}{W''(\Phi_n)}\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

For the case at hand,

$$W''(\Phi_n) = m^2_{\rm latt}\left(1+\frac{\Phi^2_n}{2}\right)$$

we remark that the mass cancels, upon taking the ratio, illustrating, also, the independence of the correlation functions on the constant C. Here we realize why writing the lattice action in terms of the Φ_n field is useful. We accept the update if $\exp(-\delta S[\Phi_n]) > r$, where r is a random number, uniformly distributed in the interval $0 \le r < 1$.

The 1–point function of the auxiliary field,

$$\langle \mathfrak{F}_n \rangle = \left\langle \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi_{n+1} - \Phi_{n-1}\right) + m^2_{\rm latt}\left(\Phi_n + \frac{\Phi^3_n}{6}\right)\right\rangle, \tag{84}$$

is expected to vanish by translation invariance and due to the fact that it is an odd function of the field, whereas the action is an even function and the only minimum is at $\Phi_n = 0 = \langle\Phi\rangle$.

So we can use the value of these 1–point functions as a check of the precision of the numerical simulations. For instance, for the figures displayed in the following, where $N = 128$, $m^2_{\rm latt} = 0.001$ and $g = 0.1$, we find that $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle = 0.18 \times 10^{-6} \pm 4.01 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\langle \Phi \rangle = 0.018 \pm 0.04$.

The non-trivial information is in the 2–and 4–point functions of the auxiliary field.

We compute $\langle \mathfrak{F}_n \mathfrak{F}_{n'} \rangle = \left\langle \mathfrak{F}_0 \mathfrak{F}_{|n-n'|} \right\rangle$, thanks to translation invariance. This, also, implies that we must take $|n - n'| < (N/2)$. To reduce numerical error of the estimator, it is a good idea to compute, in practice, the "smeared" correlator

$$\left\langle \mathfrak{F}_{|n-n'|} \mathfrak{F}_0 \right\rangle = \left\langle \mathfrak{F}_{|n-n'|+l} \mathfrak{F}_l \right\rangle = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \mathfrak{F}^{(m)}_{\mathrm{mod}(|n-n'|+l,N)} \mathfrak{F}^{(m)}_l \tag{85}$$

where $m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1$ are the samples.

The ultra–local part of the connected 4–point function,

$$B(\mathfrak{F}) \equiv \left\langle \mathfrak{F}^4_n \right\rangle - 3 \left\langle \mathfrak{F}^2_n \right\rangle^2 \tag{86}$$

(the so-called *Binder cumulant*) should, also, vanish, as a consequence of Wick's theorem, if the auxiliary field is, indeed, drawn from a Gaussian distribution, with $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle = 0$. Of course the full, connected 4–point function should vanish–it's just much easier to check the ultra–local part, which is a necessary condition, anyway. Computationally, it's better to evaluate the expression

$$B_1(\mathfrak{F}) \equiv \frac{B(\mathfrak{F})}{3 \left\langle \mathfrak{F}^2 \right\rangle^2} = \frac{\langle \mathfrak{F}^4 \rangle}{3 \langle \mathfrak{F}^2 \rangle^2} - 1 \tag{87}$$

if we simply want to test whether it's non-zero or not. The reason is that $\langle \mathfrak{F}^4 \rangle$ and $3 \langle \mathfrak{F}^2 \rangle^2$ are quite comparable in magnitude, so their difference is subject to large numerical uncertainties. Since $3 \langle \mathfrak{F}^2 \rangle^2$ is a strictly positive quantity, the vanishing–or not–of B is equivalent to that of B_1. It is, thus, B_1 that we will try to estimate. We can then compute $3 \langle \mathfrak{F}^2 \rangle^2 B_1(\mathfrak{F})$ and $3 \langle \Phi^2 \rangle^2 B_1(\Phi)$.

In section 3.1 we showed that these results for the auxiliary field test that the terms of the effective action, when written as a functional of the auxiliary field, that are proportional to positive powers of the lattice spacing, are, truly, irrelevant. Therefore we do expect that $B_1(\mathfrak{F})$ vanish. It is then useful to check that the field, Φ_n, in the scaling limit, does propagate and doesn't have Gaussian correlation functions: so we should calculate $\left\langle \Phi_{|n-n'|} \Phi_0 \right\rangle$ and $B(\Phi)$ or, rather, $B_1(\Phi)$ and check that the former isn't ultra–local and the latter two are non-zero, at the same level of numerical accuracy as we checked the correlators for the auxiliary field.

This is very challenging. The time series for the scalar shows long autocorrelation times. We do find that $|B_1(\Phi)|$ is, typically, 10 times greater than $B_1(\mathfrak{F})$. Since $\langle \Phi^2 \rangle$, also, is about 10 times greater than $\langle \mathfrak{F}^2 \rangle$, we estimate $|B(\Phi)|$, at least, a factor of 10^3 greater than $B(\mathfrak{F})$. But things can be more favorable: for example, for $N = 128$, $m^2_{\rm latt} = 0.0001$, $g = 0.1$, we find $B_1(\mathfrak{F}) = -0.0035$, whereas $B_1(\Phi) = 0.5313$ and $B(\mathfrak{F}) = -2.57 \times 10^{-13}$, whereas $B(\Phi) = 2.7 \times 10^{-8}$.

We hope to improve on these results using Hybrid Monte Carlo methods.

In fig. 1 we display typical Monte Carlo time series for the 2−point function of the auxiliary field and the scalar respectively, that provide support for the thesis that the former is ultra–local and the latter is not, for $N = 128$ and $g = 0.1$. These results, along with the indications from the Binder cumulants, illustrate that, while supersymmetry is realized in this system, it can be hard to spot. A detailed finite size scaling analysis is a priority.

In fig. 2 we show results for the 2–point functions at "strong coupling", $g = 1.0$. In this case we find that $B_1(\mathfrak{F}) = 0.0064$, $B_1(\Phi) = 0.67$, $B(\mathfrak{F}) = 4.1 \times 10^{-11}$ and $B(\Phi) = 4.41 \times 10^{-7}$. The 1–point functions are compatible with zero, $\langle F \rangle = 3.14 \times 10^{-7} \pm 4.11 \times 10^{-7}$ and $\langle \Phi \rangle = 3.14 \times 10^{-3} \pm 4.11 \times 10^{-3}$.

We generated 10^7 samples, beyond 10^6 initial configurations that were not taken into account, in order to reduce initialization effects and we kept every 5000th configuration, in an effort to reduce autocorrelation further. The time series for the 2–point function of the scalar indicates that this, still, isn't enough. However the difference between the behavior of the auxiliary field and the scalar is visible, the Binder cumulant for the former is significantly smaller than for the latter and being able to detect these differences is what counts here.

As expected, the qualitative behavior does not change and supersymmetry is realized in the "Wigner mode" at both "weak" and "strong" coupling.

5 Conclusions

In this paper we have shown, using the stochastic formulation of quantum mechanics, that worldline supersymmetry is not a property that must be added to quantum mechanics, to obtain "supersymmetric quantum mechanics", but is an intrinsic property thereof–far from being surprised at its presence, we should be surprised it hasn't been noticed till now. What had not been appreciated was the fact that, when the algebra of the $\gamma-$matrices is abelian, the kinetic term for Grassmann variables is a total derivative–they can't propagate, only composite quantities thereof can have local correlation functions, that are completely determined by the correlation functions of the "scalar" fields (the coordinate(s) of the particle). How constraints can be taken into account [22] is, of course, an interesting challenge to take on, with the tools developed here.

On the mathematical level these facts were known [23]–however the relation to the work of refs. [2, 5, 6] was not made, so the Grassmann variables were seen as new objects, to be added at our discretion and were not recognized as already present, as the local expression of quantum fluctuations. While such variables were noticed in ref. [24] to evade the assumptions of Bell's theorem, nonetheless, there, also, they were introduced in an *ad hoc* manner and their physical origin and relevance was left an open issue. As we found, they appear only as bilinears that have non-local correlation functions–this is how the non-locality of quantum mechanics is realized.

The question of whether the Grassmann variables studied here can be identified with the "hidden variables" of Einstein is thus answered in the affirmative, for the case that $W''[\phi] > 0$.



Figure 1: Monte Carlo time series, for the 2–point, functions, $\langle \mathfrak{F}_{|n-n'|}\mathfrak{F}_0\rangle$, and $\langle \Phi_{|n-n'|}\Phi_0\rangle$, for $|n-n'| < 64$, for $N = 128$, $g = 0.1$. The value of $m^2_{\rm latt} = 0.0001$.



Figure 2: Monte Carlo time series, for the 2–point, functions, $\langle \mathfrak{F}_{|n-n'|}\mathfrak{F}_0\rangle$, and $\langle \Phi_{|n-n'|}\Phi_0\rangle$, for $|n-n'| < 64$, for $N = 128$, $g = 1.0$. The value of $m^2_{\rm latt} = 0.0001$.

The reason is that they can be identified with the degrees of freedom, that make a local contribution to the partition function, that allow us to take it equal to 1. The fact that the partition function is finite means, simply, that the free energy can be reconstructed from the correlation functions. It doesn't mean that the degrees of freedom that can lead to its taking a universal value (independent of the parameters of the theory) have local dynamics. The anticommuting variables studied here do have this latter property.

For the case where $W''[\phi]$ can vanish, the calculations require more care and will be presented in future work.

What these results highlight is the relevance of the solutions to the first order equations, $F = 0$, the so-called BPS states [28]. The correlation functions of the auxiliary field, as functionals of the scalar(s) (for chiral supermultiplets), and the relevance of the identities these satisfy, for describing supersymmetry breaking, encode, in particular, the non-renormalization theorems of supersymmetry [32]; however, since their study involves non-perturbative aspects, how to use them effectively is non-trivial and is at the heart of the breakthroughs in supersymmetric gauge theories (cf. ref. [33] for a review). In the present work we have pushed the work of refs. [2, 5, 10] to its logical conclusion, by harnessing the power of numerical techniques for testing the validity of the stochastic identities. These identities express how supersymmetry is–or is not–realized, beyond the classical action. It can be realized in the "Wigner mode", when the superpotential possesses a unique minimum. In this case the auxiliary field is Gaussian, but with special features: (a) its 1–point function vanishes, $\langle F \rangle = 0$, its 2–point function is ultra–local, $\langle F_n F_{n'} \rangle = \text{const} \times \delta_{n,n'}$; the multi–point functions, $\langle F_{n_1} F_{n_2} \cdots F_{n_{2k}} \rangle$ are, of course, given by Wick's theorem.

In the "Nambu–Goldstone mode" the only thing that changes in these statements is that the 1–point function of the auxiliary field is non-zero, $\langle F \rangle \neq 0$. All other correlation functions satisfy the same relations, that express the fact that the auxiliary field has Gaussian correlations. In this case the supersymmetry transformations imply that the "fermion", ψ_α, or χ_α can be identified with the goldstino, the massless particle that appears when a global symmetry is spontaneously broken [34]. Its presence is, of course, a major issue in supersymmetry phenomenology. How it appears in this context, where only "fermionic bilinears" are defined, remains to be described.

However, as was found in ref. [1], there is a third option, in the zero–dimensional case: The identities for the correlation functions of the auxiliary field can have additional, anomalous, terms. The issue that remains to be clarified, therefore, is, whether this option can occur in one dimension. If it could, this would imply that the theory isn't unitary, since the auxiliary field would not have an ultra–local 2–point function. This means that new degrees of freedom should appear. In section 3.2 we showed what these may be: the "dual field(s)", $\{p_n\}$, cf. also [6]. Since these do not have dynamics that can be usefully studied in perturbation theory, in terms of the original scalar, numerical simulations are the natural tool. Whether, in this way, it may be possible to break supersymmetry in a new way, in quantum mechanics and, then, in quantum field theory, while retaining the usefulness of the stochastic identities remains to be studied.

What renders this approach effective is the control the Grassmann variables offer over the quantum fluctuations. Quantum mechanics *is*, in fact, a local theory but the variables that are needed to realize locality are Grassmann variables. These appear as bilinears, that are not described by a local action, however, as can be seen from the properties of their correlation fuctions. This, of course, leads to the issue of their precise relation with entanglement, which remains to be elucidated. The boundary fermionic terms are expected to play a role here. We hope to provide a fuller account in future work.

Quantum mechanics has been, traditionally, studied in phase space, i.e. in the Hamiltonian formalism–while quantum field theory has been studied in configuration space, i.e. in the Lagrangian formalism. While the Lagrangian formalism for quantum mechanics was introduced by Dirac and Feynman [25] as an explicitly space-time approach to quantum mechanics, in what way a quantum test particle probes spacetime differently than a classical test particle has not been spelled out–indeed what might replace the concept of a trajectory, when quantum effects are taken into account, was often declared to be meaningless.

In this paper we have shown, by explicit calculation that this is not true–by considering quantum mechanics as a quantum field theory, where the Poincaré group consists of the time translations only, we have found that how a quantum test particle can probe space-time can be described using the tools of quantum field theory[3] and that it explores superspace in the same sense that a classical test particle explores space: the trajectory of a quantum test particle probes (super)space, with the anticommuting coordinates describing the quantum fluctuations: the classical trajectory, $\phi(\tau)$, becomes a chiral superfield, $(\phi(\tau), \psi_\alpha(\tau), F(\tau))$, per direction of time, which is controlled by the anticommuting variables. We therefore realize that the superparticle [7, 28] is, in fact, the quantum particle. Supersymmetric quantum mechanics is quantum mechanics.

A quantum test particle explores superspace in a very special way, as can be seen from the correlation functions of the fields. The "anticommuting" dimensions, $\psi_\alpha(\tau)$ are described through ultra–local scalar fields, $\mathfrak{s}(\tau) \equiv \psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)$, whose correlation functions are given by correlators of $\exp(-\log W''(\phi))$, when $W''(\phi) > 0$. A superspace formulation should be possible, which may lead to a covariant gauge–fixing for the $\kappa-$symmetry. [4]

It is, of course, legitimate to ask, whether this approach is another formulation of quantum mechanics and whether it might have consequences that might be amenable to a particular experimental test. The answer to both is Yes. Regarding the first question, however, the present formulation highlights that supersymmetry is not, simply, mathematically interesting and a tool for quantum field theory, but appears in ordinary quantum mechanics, in a way that had not been noticed to date. The stochastic approach allows us to identify the degrees of freedom that give rise to quantum fluctuations, to simplify considerably the calculations performed to date with them in the context of supersymmetric quantum mechanics and leads to numerical algorithms that are straightforward to implement.

It allows us to imagine new experiments for quantum matter on the one hand and, on the

[3]Ref. [26], too, remains within classical space-time.

[4]The constraints, within the path integral formalism, were, also, studied in ref. [27].

other hand, to use it as a testing ground in order to better understand the role supersymmetry might play in physics in general. For the moment we have studied one chiral multiplet. By introducing more, we are probing a richer target space, where spin can play a role [29] and, thus, that could accommodate target space supersymmetry [30, 31]. We hope to report on progress on this in the near future. Let us just remark that, in D space dimensions, the Langevin equation is given by

$$\frac{d\phi^I(\tau)}{d\tau} = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi^I(\tau)} + \eta^I(\tau) \tag{88}$$

for $I = 1, 2, \ldots, D$. Therefore the classical action takes the following form

$$S_{\text{eff}}[\phi^I, \psi^I_\alpha] = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\phi^I}{d\tau} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi^I} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \psi^I_\alpha(\tau) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \left(\frac{d}{d\tau} \delta_{IJ} + \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi^I \phi^J} \right) \psi^J_\alpha(\tau) \right] \tag{89}$$

with $\{\psi^I_\alpha, \psi^J_\beta\} = 0$. Since we are working in the functional integral formalism, all variables are "classical", therefore it's expected that, in this relation, the right hand side isn't non-zero, proportional to δ^{IJ} [29]. Once more, the anticommuting variables are not ghosts [4]. This relation implies that $\psi^I_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi^J_\beta = \psi^J_\alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi^I_\beta$, therefore it is symmetric under exchange of the indices I and J and can give a non-zero result when it couples to the second derivative of the superpotential. In this way it is possible to describe massive "fermions" on the worldline. Here, too, the action in eq. (89) does not have manifest supersymmetry–the $\kappa-$symmetry has been fixed. This action is invariant under time translations and spatial rotations and is, of course, non-relativistic.

The fermionic kinetic term is, still, a total derivative. To elucidate the physical meaning of the anticomuting variables, let us introduce a, background, electromagnetic field [35]. The vector potential is described by the functions $A^I(\phi)$ and can be introduced in the action through the standard minimal coupling prescription, leading to a coupling with the trajectory

$$q A^I \frac{d\phi^J}{d\tau} \delta_{IJ} \tag{90}$$

with q the electric charge.

The way the $A^I(\phi)$ couple to the fermions is through a "Pauli term",

$$S_{\text{Pauli}} = \int d\tau \, \mathsf{g} \psi^I_\alpha \left[\frac{\sigma_A}{2} \right]^{\alpha\beta} n^B \delta_{AB} \partial_I A_J(\phi) \psi^J_\beta \tag{91}$$

and this allows us to identify the ψ^I_α with the components of the spin vector [29], since this is, in fact, the term $\mathsf{g}\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathsf{B}$, with g the gyromagnetic ratio. This is, of course, consistent with the non-relativistic dynamics of a point particle.

It is intriguing to attempt to integrate out the "fermions" in this case. We would then obtain as partition function

$$Z[A^I] = \int [d\phi] \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi^I \partial \phi^J} + \mathsf{g} F_{IJ} \right) \right| e^{-S[\phi, A^I]} \tag{92}$$

with $F_{IJ} = \partial_I A_J - \partial_J A_I$. The vanishing of the determinant would be expressed in a condition on the flux–reminiscent of flux compactifications [36].

We need to describe, in the stochastic formalism, the corresponding relativistic dynamics, which will lead to quantum field theory and target space spinors. We, also, realize that the action, that contains the vector potential terms, is not invariant under supersymmetry transformations: we have attempted to couple chiral superfields to a vector field. We should, of course, include the other components of the vector multiplet. How this may be done in the stochastic formalism remains to be worked out.

The present calculations describe the "bulk" behavior of Euclidian quantum mechanics. The (zero–dimensional) "boundary" dynamics alone was studied in ref. [1]. By imposing Dirichlet boundary conditions we may study boundary–bulk effects [37] using the tools developed here.

Regarding possible experimental consequences, these rely on atom trap technology that has been developed in the 90's and thereafter–and was not available in the 80's. It should be possible to measure the correlation functions of the auxiliary field, which hasn't been the subject of any particular attention to date. We hope to report on a more detailed proposal in future work.

Acknowledgements: It's a pleasure to thank C. P. Bachas, E. G. Floratos and J. Iliopoulos for their constructive criticism and M. Axenides, X. Bekaert, B. Boisseau and H. Giacomini for helpful suggestions. The warm hospitality of the LPTENS and the NRCPS "Demokritos" is gratefully acknowledged.

A Perturbation Theory

In this appendix we want to show how the contribution of the anticommuting variables reproduces the contributions of the familiar loop expansion. We shall use the partition function as a particularly simple example.

The loop expansion of the partition function is given by the following expression about the extremum $\phi = \phi^*$, defined by $S'[\phi^*] = 0$:

$$Z = \int [d\phi]\, e^{-S[\phi]} = e^{-S[\phi^*]} \int \left[\frac{du}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right] e^{-\frac{u^2}{2!}S''[\phi^*]} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-)^p}{p!} \left(\sum_{l=3}^{\infty} \frac{u^l}{l!} S^{(l)}[\phi^*]\right)^p = e^{-S[\phi^*]-\frac{1}{2}\log S''[\phi^*]} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-)^p}{p!} \left\langle \left(\sum_{l=3}^{\infty} \frac{v^l}{l!} \frac{S^{(l)}[\phi^*]}{(S''[\phi^*)^{l/2}}\right)^p \right\rangle \tag{93}$$

The index p counts the loops, as follows: $p = 0$ is the one–loop contribution (included explicitly as $(1/2)\log S''[\phi^*]$), $p = 1$ is the two–loop contribution, so the pth term is the $p+1-$loop contribution. The notation is compact and must be specified more carefully for the case when S is not ultra–local. We shall use the ultra–local case, since the expressions are simpler and comment on the differences the local case introduces.

The average is with respect to the Gaussian weight $\exp(-v^2/2)/\sqrt{2\pi}$, therefore, only even powers contribute.

The stochastic approach now allows us to understand that the corrections to $S[\phi^*]$ can be obtained by the expansion of $W''[\phi^*]$, in the sense that they can be cancelled by its contribution. This means that, if we compute

$$\begin{aligned} Z = \int \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, e^{-S[\phi]}\, W''[\phi] = e^{-S[\phi^*]-\frac{1}{2}\log S''[\phi^*]+\log W''[\phi^*]}\times \\ \int \frac{dv}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, e^{-\frac{v^2}{2}} \left(1+\sum_{p=1}\frac{(-)^p}{p!}\left(\sum_{l=3}^{\infty}\frac{v^l}{l!}\frac{S^{(l)}[\phi^*]}{\left(S''[\phi^*]\right)^{l/2}}\right)^p\right)\left(1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{v^n}{n!}\frac{W^{(n+2)}[\phi^*]}{W''[\phi^*]\left(S''[\phi^*]\right)^{n/2}}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

with $S[\phi^*] = (W'[\phi^*])^2/2$, we expect to find

$$Z = e^{-S[\phi^*]} = 1 \tag{95}$$

We remark that the corrections are labeled by two integers, p and n. For example, if we take $p = 0, n = 0$ we find

$$Z_{1s} = e^{-S[\phi^*]-\frac{1}{2}\log S''[\phi^*]+\log W''[\phi^*]} = e^{-S[\phi^*]} = 1 \tag{96}$$

This is true, because $S''[\phi^*] = W''[\phi^*]^2$, since we are expanding about the point where $S'[\phi^*] = W'[\phi^*]W''[\phi^*] = 0$ and, since $W''[\phi^*] > 0$, therefore $W'[\phi^*] = 0$.

As we expand eq. (94)

$$\begin{aligned} Z = e^{-S[\phi^*]-\frac{1}{2}\log S''[\phi^*]+\log W''[\phi^*]}\left[1+\int \frac{dv}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, e^{-\frac{v^2}{2}}\sum_{p=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-)^p}{p!}\left(\sum_{l=3}^{\infty}\frac{v^l}{l!}\frac{S^{(l)}[\phi^*]}{\left(S''[\phi^*]\right)^{l/2}}\right)^p + \right. \\ \int \frac{dv}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, e^{-\frac{v^2}{2}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{v^n}{n!}\frac{W^{(n+2)}[\phi^*]}{W''[\phi^*]\left(S''[\phi^*]\right)^{n/2}} + \\ \left. \int \frac{dv}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, e^{-\frac{v^2}{2}}\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-)^p}{p!}\left(\sum_{l=3}^{\infty}\frac{v^l}{l!}\frac{S^{(l)}[\phi^*]}{\left(S''[\phi^*]\right)^{l/2}}\right)^p\right)\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{v^n}{n!}\frac{W^{(n+2)}[\phi^*]}{W''[\phi^*]\left(S''[\phi^*]\right)^{n/2}}\right)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

we can track the cancellation, as a function of n and p. We notice that the first sum contains the loop corrections that involve the "scalar", the second–which can be computed immediately– involve the "fermions". There is, however, a third term, that involves both. We see that we can perform the sum over n (i.e. sum over the "fermion loops") independently of the sum over p. For a polynomial superpotential the sum over n is finite–for the quartic example, $n = 0, 2$ in the second term, while the $n = 1$ term contributes, also, in the third sum.

The partition function is a function only of the parameters that define $S[\phi]$, namely the mass and coupling constant m^2 and λ. The computation shows that, to leading order in the loop expansion, it is equal to 1, since $S[\phi^*] = 0$, therefore doesn't depend on the parameters of the theory. The corrections, that depend on S, reinstate this dependence: $(1/2)\log S''[\phi^*]$ does

depend on m^2 and λ and so do the higher derivatives and the loop corrections they contribute to the partition function. In addition, the corrections embodied in the sum over p indicate that this dependence can be very complicated and the expansion is by no means guaranteed to converge at all.

What does ensure convergence is the term $W''[\phi]$ and its expansion. And this is achieved through the relation between $S[\phi]$ and $W[\phi]$ and the fact that $W''[\phi]$ never vanishes. The corrections do not affect the relation $S[\phi] = (W'[\phi])^2/2$, which implies that the higher order derivatives, $S^{(l)}[\phi^*]$, $l > 2$, are given by the relation

$$S^{(l)}[\phi^*] = \sum_{k=0}^{l} \left(\begin{array}{c} l \\ k \end{array} \right) \left[W^{(k+2)}[\phi^*] W^{(l-k+2)}[\phi^*] + W^{(k+1)}[\phi^*] W^{(l-k+3)}[\phi^*] \right] \tag{98}$$

Along with the fact that $W''[\phi] > 0$, this relation ensures the cancellations between the contributions coming from the S terms and the W terms and is a "zero–dimensional" illustration of the non-renormalization theorems [32].

We can carry out the calculation for the one–dimensional case, i.e. quantum mechanics, also. This time the equation $S'[\phi^*] = 0$ is a differential equation. However, since the action is a perfect square, it satisfies the inequality $S[\phi] \geq S[\phi^*]$. Therefore, ϕ^*, solution of the second order equation

$$S'[\phi] = 0 \Leftrightarrow -\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}\phi + W'[\phi] W''[\phi] = 0 \tag{99}$$

is, in fact, the solution of the first order equation

$$\frac{d\phi}{d\tau} + W'[\phi] = 0 \tag{100}$$

subject to the boundary conditions $\phi(0) = \phi(T)$. Since $W''[\phi] > 0$, the only translation invariant solution is $\phi(\tau) = \phi^* = 0$, where $W'[\phi^*] = 0$. This is a solution of both equations (99) and (100).

To 1–loop order we have

$$S_{\rm eff}[\phi^*] = S[\phi^*] + \frac{1}{2}{\rm Tr}\log\left(-\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} + \left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2 + W'[\phi^*] W'''[\phi^*] \right) - {\rm Tr}\log\left(\frac{d}{d\tau} + W''[\phi^*] \right) \tag{101}$$

Since $W'[\phi^*] = 0$, these expressions simplify considerably:

$$\frac{1}{2}{\rm Tr}\log\left(-\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} + \left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2 + W'[\phi^*] W'''[\phi^*] \right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log\left(\frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{T^2} + \left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2 + W'[\phi^*] W'''[\phi^*] \right) =$$
$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{T^2} + \left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2 \right) \tag{102}$$

for the "scalar" contribution and

$$\mathrm{Tr}\log\left(\frac{d}{d\tau}+W''[\phi^*]\right)=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\log\left(\mathrm{i}\frac{2\pi n}{T}+W''[\phi^*]\right) \tag{103}$$

for the "fermionic" contribution. We have introduced an infrared cutoff, T and an ultraviolet cutoff, N–the latter is a cutoff on the eigenvalues of the operators.

We notice that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{i}\frac{2\pi n}{T}+W''[\phi^*]=\left(\frac{4\pi^2n^2}{T^2}+\left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\,e^{\mathrm{i}\theta_n}\Leftrightarrow\\&\log\left(\mathrm{i}\frac{2\pi n}{T}+W''[\phi^*]\right)=\frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{4\pi^2n^2}{T^2}+\left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2\right)+\mathrm{i}\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2\pi n}{W''[\phi^*]T}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

The phase gives rise to the winding number computed in ref. [6]. Periodic boundary conditions imply that, when we sum over all values of $0\leq n\leq N-1$, with $W''[\phi^*]>0$, we are summing over all possible values of θ_n, therefore the sum vanishes–which expresses the stability of the ground state, since this sum represents the imaginary part of the free energy and, thus, the putative decay rate of the vacuum.

We deduce that the cancellation

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\log\left(-\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}+\left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2+W'[\phi^*]W'''[\phi^*]\right)-\mathrm{Tr}\log\left(\frac{d}{d\tau}+W''[\phi^*]\right)=\\&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\log\left(1+\frac{W'[\phi^*]W'''[\phi^*]}{\frac{4\pi^2n^2}{T^2}+\left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

is exact, between the 1–loop contribution of the scalar and that coming from the contribution of the "fermions". Using the Euler–Maclaurin formula we may replace the sum by an integral and find

$$\begin{aligned}&V^{(1)}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\phi^*)=\frac{1}{2}\left(W'[\phi^*]\right)^2+\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{dk}{2\pi}\,\log\left(1+\frac{W'[\phi^*]W'''[\phi^*]}{k^2+\left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2}\right)=\\&\frac{1}{2}\left(W'[\phi^*]\right)^2+\frac{1}{2}\left(W''[\phi^*]-\sqrt{W'[\phi^*]W'''[\phi^*]+\left(W''[\phi^*]\right)^2}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

which corresponds, reassuringly, to the, usual, perturbative, result. We readily identify the zero–point energy, $W''[\phi^*]/2$ and the correction thereto, given by the square root term, that suppresses it, since $W'[\phi^*]=0$ and $W''[\phi^*]>0$. . In the usual approach we must perform the subtraction, in order to obtain a finite result, by hand–here we see that the "fermionic contribution" realizes such a subtraction–but the boundary contribution, represented by the contribution of the $\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}d/d\tau$ term is crucial.

Now we may ask, (a) whether these cancellations hold to all orders of the loop expansion; (b) even if we prove that they do, whether there are non-perturbative corrections and (c) whether the expansion converges at all, in order for the calculation to make sense. The answer to all

these questions lies in the fact that the stochastic fluctuations, for the case of a superpotential with a single minimum, satisfy the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, W''[\phi]\, e^{-\frac{W'[\phi]^2}{2}} = 1 \\
&\int \left[\frac{d\phi(\tau)}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right] \det\left(\frac{d}{d\tau} + W''[\phi]\right)\, e^{-\int d\tau\, \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{d\phi}{d\tau}+W'[\phi]\right)^2} = 1
\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

therefore that the expression within the square brackets of eq. (97) does exponentiate to give contributions that cancel between those that come from S and those that come from W, thereby confirming that the system, made up of the original scalar variable and the fluctuations, is closed–and the fluctuations are, indeed, given by the contribution of the W'' factor in the integral.

The stochastic approach, thus, not only sums up the quantum corrections, but provides insight as to their origin, in terms of physical degrees of freedom.

If W'' can vanish, however, the calculation is more complicated and the dual description of subsection 3.2 remains to be spelled out. This would imply that new degrees of freedom appear. The reason is that, the classical vacuum isn't, just, $\phi = \phi^*$, but there exist instanton configurations, that interpolate between the different minima of the classical potential and their contribution must be taken into account. This might be achieved by working with the dual variables, $\{p_n\}$.

The bottom line is that, when the partition function is finite, therefore the free energy can be reconstructed from its correlation functions, we may ask whether there exist degrees of freedom that close the system, thus make the partition function independent of the particular parameters (mass and coupling constant) of the degrees of freedom and what is their dynamics. For quantum mechanics of a point particle in one dimension we have found that such, local, degrees of freedom can be found: they are, however, anticommuting and not commuting and mix with the position of the particle in an interesting way. In the non-relativistic case studied here they appear as effective scalars, with non-local dynamics, thereby illustrating both Einstein's intuition and Bell's theorem.

B The correlation functions of the $\mathfrak{s}(\tau)-$field

We prove eq. (28). The $n-$point function of the fermion bilinear, $\mathfrak{s}(\tau) \equiv \psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)$ is given by the expression

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \mathfrak{s}(\tau_0)\mathfrak{s}(\tau_1)\cdots\mathfrak{s}(\tau_{n-1})\rangle = \\
&Z^{-1}\int [d\phi]\, e^{-S_\phi[\phi]}\, [d\psi_\alpha]\, \psi_{\alpha_0}(\tau_0)\varepsilon^{\alpha_0\beta_0}\psi_{\beta_0}(\tau_0)\cdots\psi_{\alpha_{n-1}}(\tau_{n-1})\varepsilon^{\alpha_{n-1}\beta_{n-1}}\psi_{\beta_{n-1}}(\tau_{n-1})\, e^{\int d\tau\, \frac{1}{2}\psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)W''(\phi(\tau))}
\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

When we expand out the exponentials, we will produce a product of $(1+W''(\phi(\tau)\mathfrak{s}(\tau))$ factors. Every time the $W''(\phi(\tau))\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$ factor from the exponential encounters the matching $\mathfrak{s}$ factor from

the correlator, the contribution of W'' will be eliminated. All other factors will be eliminated by the measure, since their Grassmann variables will not be saturated. "Elimination" of a W'' factor means that we divide it out of the product, which is well–defined, since we assume that W'' remains of fixed sign. For example, for the 1–point function,

$$\langle \mathfrak{s}(\tau) \rangle = Z^{-1} \int [d\phi]\, e^{-S_\phi[\phi]} [d\psi_\alpha] \psi_\alpha(\tau) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta(\tau) \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} (1 + W''(\phi(\tau_k)) \mathfrak{s}(\tau_k)) \tag{109}$$

where we have used a lattice regularization. In the absence of the $\mathfrak{s}(\tau) \equiv \psi_\alpha(\tau)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta(\tau)$, only the term of the product that contains all $\mathfrak{s}$ factors will saturate the corresponding fermionic factors of the measure and, thus, give rise to the product of $W''(\phi)$ factors that exponentiate to $\exp(\int d\tau \log W''(\phi(\tau)))$. In the presence of $\mathfrak{s}(\tau)$, the term that will saturate the factors of the measure will be the term of the product that does *not* contain this term, therefore does not contain the corresponding $W''(\phi(\tau))$ factor. The result will be a product of $N-1$, instead of N, terms, which we can write as

$$[W(\phi(\tau))]^{-1} \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} W''(\phi(\tau_n)) = e^{-\int d\sigma\, \delta(\sigma-\tau) \log W''(\phi(\sigma))}\, e^{\int d\sigma\, \frac{1}{2} \psi_\alpha(\sigma) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta(\sigma) W''(\phi(\sigma))} \tag{110}$$

which proves eq. (28) for $n = 1$. By induction we may easily extend the proof to any value of n. This expression is an example of the Ward–Takahashi identity mentioned in ref. [2], namely

$$\left\langle \psi_\alpha(\tau) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta(\tau) \right\rangle = \left\langle (W''[\phi(\tau)])^{-1} \right\rangle = \left\langle e^{-\log W''[\phi(\tau)]} \right\rangle \tag{111}$$

Once more this holds, if W'' can't vanish, of course.

C The centered moments of the cubic superpotential

In ref. [1] we found explicit expressions for the moments of the ultra–local density, with cubic superpotential,

$$W(\phi) = c\phi + \frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{3!}\phi^3 \tag{112}$$

namely

$$\langle \phi^p \rangle = (-)^p \left(\frac{m^2}{\lambda}\right)^p \sum_{k=0}^{p} \left(\begin{array}{c} p \\ 2k \end{array} \right) \left(\frac{2\lambda}{m^4}\right)^k \left\langle F^k \right\rangle_F \tag{113}$$

where

$$\left\langle F^k \right\rangle_F = \frac{\int_{c-\frac{m^4}{2\lambda}}^{\infty} dF\, F^k\, e^{-F^2/2}}{\int_{c-\frac{m^4}{2\lambda}}^{\infty} dF\, e^{-F^2/2}} \tag{114}$$

This cubic superpotential leads to the following classical, scalar potential:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}W'(\phi)^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(c - \frac{m^4}{2\lambda} + \left(\phi + \frac{m^2}{\lambda}\right)^2\right)^2 \tag{115}$$

We note that, for $c \geq m^4/(2\lambda)$, the, classical, potential has one minimum, while, for $c < m^4/(2\lambda)$, it has two. The quantum potential, always, has one minimum, at $\langle\phi\rangle = -m^2/\lambda$. Its expression is completely different from $V(\phi)$ and must be determined from the correlation functions [16].

We would like to show that these expressions imply that

$$\langle(\phi - \langle\phi\rangle)^{2p+1}\rangle = 0 \tag{116}$$

This then implies that $\langle\exp(\mathrm{i}\alpha(\phi - \langle\phi\rangle))\rangle$ is real, for α real.

To use Bochner's theorem, we must prove that the measure, defined by these moments, is convex, i.e. that

$$\langle\exp(\phi - \langle\phi\rangle)\rangle \geq \exp(\langle\phi - \langle\phi\rangle\rangle) = 1 \tag{117}$$

This inequality, in fact, is a consequence of eq. (116), since, in that case, the left hand side of the inequality is a sum of even powers of $\phi - \langle\phi\rangle$ only and, therefore, is greater than or equal to the constant term, which is equal to 1. The converse is not true, of course.

The proof of eq.(116) goes as follows:

We expand

$$\begin{aligned}\langle(\phi - \langle\phi\rangle)^{2p+1}\rangle = \sum_{l=0}^{2p+1}\left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1 \\ l \end{array}\right)\langle\phi^l\rangle(-)^{2p+1-l}\langle\phi\rangle^{2p+1-l} = \\ \left(\frac{m^2}{\lambda}\right)^{2p+1}\sum_{l=0}^{2p+1}\left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1 \\ l \end{array}\right)(-)^l\sum_{k=0}^{l}\left(\begin{array}{c} l \\ 2k \end{array}\right)\left(\frac{2\lambda}{m^4}\right)^k\left\langle F^k\right\rangle_F\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

and remark that the sum over the $2p+2$ terms splits into two sums, each over $p+1$ terms: One over the even values of the index $l = 2r$,

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p}\left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1 \\ 2r \end{array}\right)\sum_{k=0}^{r}\left(\begin{array}{c} 2r \\ 2k \end{array}\right)\left(\frac{2\lambda}{m^4}\right)^k\left\langle F^k\right\rangle_F \tag{119}$$

and one over the odd values of the index $l = 2r+1$,

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p}\left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1 \\ 2r+1 \end{array}\right)\sum_{k=0}^{r}\left(\begin{array}{c} 2r+1 \\ 2k \end{array}\right)\left(\frac{2\lambda}{m^4}\right)^k\left\langle F^k\right\rangle_F \tag{120}$$

We would like to prove that these expressions are equal.

We rearrange the sums, collecting the terms that contribute to the coefficient of the $\langle F^k \rangle_F (2\lambda/m^4)^k$. We find that the coefficient of this term, in eq. (119), is given by the expression

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1 \\ 2k+2r \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} 2k+2r \\ 2k \end{array} \right) = \frac{(2p+1)!}{(2k)!} \sum_{r=0}^{p} \frac{1}{(2r)!(2p+1-2k-2r)!} \tag{121}$$

whereas the coefficient of the corresponding term in eq. (120) is

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1 \\ 2k+2r+1 \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} 2k+2r+1 \\ 2k \end{array} \right) = \frac{(2p+1)!}{(2k)!} \sum_{r=0}^{p} \frac{1}{(2r+1)!(2p-2k-2r)!} \tag{122}$$

We shall now prove that these expressions are equal, for all values of k. The idea is to multiply both by $(2p+1-2k)!$. Then the right hand side in eq. (121) becomes

$$\frac{(2p+1)!}{(2k)!} \sum_{r=0}^{p} \frac{(2p+1-2k)!}{(2r)!(2p+1-2k-2r)!} = \frac{(2p+1)!}{(2k)!} \sum_{r=0}^{p} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1-2k \\ 2r \end{array} \right) \tag{123}$$

The right hand side of eq. (122) becomes

$$\frac{(2p+1)!}{(2k)!} \sum_{r=0}^{p} \frac{(2p+1-2k)!}{(2r+1)!(2p-2k-2r)!} = \frac{(2p+1)!}{(2k)!} \sum_{r=0}^{p} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1-2k \\ 2r+1 \end{array} \right) \tag{124}$$

If we subtract the right hand sides we find the expression

$$\frac{(2p+1)!}{(2k)!} \sum_{l=0}^{2p-2k+1} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2p+1-2k \\ l \end{array} \right) (-)^l \tag{125}$$

This expression equals $(1-1)^{2p-2k+1} = 0$.

This, argument does not go through for $\langle (\phi - \langle \phi \rangle)^{2p} \rangle$, an expression that contains $2p+1$, i.e. an odd number of terms–thus the cancellation is incomplete and these moments do not vanish.

References

[1] S. Nicolis and A. Zerkak, "Supersymmetric probability distributions",*J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **46** (2013)285401. [arXiv:1302.2361 [hep-th]].

[2] G. Parisi and N. Sourlas, "Random Magnetic Fields, Supersymmetry and Negative Dimensions," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43** (1979) 744.

G. Parisi and N. Sourlas, "Critical Behavior of Branched Polymers and the Lee-Yang Edge Singularity," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46** (1981) 871;

G. Parisi and N. Sourlas, "Selfavoiding Walk And Supersymmetry," LPTENS-80/8.

G. Parisi and N. Sourlas, "Supersymmetric Field Theories and Stochastic Differential Equations," *Nucl. Phys.* **B206** (1982) 321.

K. Mallick, M. Moshe and H. Orland, "A Field-theoretic approach to nonequilibrium work identities," *J. Phys.* **A44** (2011) 095002 [arXiv:1009.4800 [cond-mat.stat-mech]].

J. Tailleur, S. Tanase-Nicola and J. Kurchan, "Kramers equation and supersymmetry", *J. Stat. Phys.* **122** (2006) 557. cond-mat/0503545.

C. Aron, G. Biroli and L. F. Cugliandolo, "Symmetries of generating functionals of Langevin processes with colored multiplicative noise," *J. Stat. Mech.* **1011** (2010) P11018 [arXiv:1007.5059 [cond-mat.stat-mech]].

[3] J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, Int. Ser. Monogr. Phys. **113** (2002) 1.

[4] A. S. Wightman, "The spin–statistics connection: Some pedagogical remarks in response to Neuenschwander's question", *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations, Conf. 04* (2000) 207. http://www.emis.de/journals/EJDE/conf-proc/04/w1/wightman.pdf

[5] H. Nicolai, "Supersymmetry And Functional Integration Measures," *Nucl. Phys.* **B176** (1980) 419.

H. Nicolai, "On a New Characterization of Scalar Supersymmetric Theories," *Phys. Lett.* **B89** (1980) 341.

[6] S. Cecotti and L. Girardello, "Stochastic And Parastochastic Aspects Of Supersymmetric Functional Measures: A New Nonperturbative Approach To Supersymmetry," *Annals Phys.* **145** (1983) 81.

S. Cecotti and L. Girardello, "Functional Measure, Topology and Dynamical Supersymmetry Breaking," *Phys. Lett.* **B110** (1982) 39.

J. Sonner and D. Tong, "Berry Phase and Supersymmetry," JHEP **0901** (2009) 063 [arXiv:0810.1280 [hep-th]].

[7] L. Brink and J. H. Schwarz, "Quantum Superspace," *Phys. Lett.* **B100** (1981) 310.

W. Siegel, "Hidden Local Supersymmetry in the Supersymmetric Particle Action," *Phys. Lett.* **B128** (1983) 397.

E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh and A. Van Proeyen, "Superparticle actions and gauge fixings," *Class. Quant. Grav.* **9** (1992) 321.

[8] N. I. Akhiezer and I. M. Glazman, *Theory of linear operators in Hilbert space*, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. (1963).

[9] P. H. Damgaard and K. Tsokos, "Stochastic Quantization, Supersymmetry And The Nicolai Map," *Lett. Math. Phys.* **8** (1984) 535.

P. H. Damgaard and K. Tsokos, "Stochastic Quantization With Fermions," *Nucl. Phys.* **B235** (1984) 75.

P. H. Damgaard and H. Huffel, "Stochastic Quantization," *Phys. Rept.* **152** (1987) 227.

[10] V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini, G. Furlan and M. Roncadelli, "Operator Ordering and Supersymmetry," *Nucl. Phys.* **B296** (1988) 402.

V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini, G. Veneziano and G. Furlan, "Nicolai Mapping And Stochastic Identities In Supersymmetric Field Theories," *Phys. Rept.* **137** (1986) 55.

V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini, G. Furlan and G. Veneziano, "Stochastic Identities In Quantum Theory," *Nucl. Phys.* **B255** (1985) 1.

V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini, G. Furlan and G. Veneziano, "Stochastic Identities In Supersymmetric Theories," *Phys. Lett.* **B142** (1984) 399.

V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini and G. Furlan, "On the Functional Formulation of Quantum Field Theory," *Nuovo Cim.* **A74** (1983) 365.

[11] J. Dubédat, "Topics in abelian spin models and related problems", *Probability Surveys*, **8** (2011) 374 [arXiv:1112.4404 [math.PR]]

[12] E. Witten, "Dynamical Breaking of Supersymmetry," *Nucl. Phys.* **B188** (1981) 513.

E. Witten, "Constraints on Supersymmetry Breaking," *Nucl. Phys.* **B202** (1982) 253.

E. Witten, "Supersymmetry and Morse theory," *J. Diff. Geom.* **17** (1982) 661.

F. Cooper and B. Freedman, "Aspects of Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanics", *Ann. Phys.* **146** (1982) 262.

F. Cooper, A. Khare and U. Sukhatme, "Supersymmetry and quantum mechanics," *Phys. Rept.* **251** (1995) 267 [hep-th/9405029].

P. A. Horváthy, M. S. Plyushchay and M. Valenzuela, "Bosons, fermions and anyons in the plane, and supersymmetry," *Annals Phys.* **325** (2010) 1931 [arXiv:1001.0274 [hep-th]].

V. K. Oikonomou, "Localized Fermions on Domain Walls and Extended Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanics," *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31** (2014) 025018 [arXiv:1308.2085 [hep-th]].

[13] F. Pientka *et al.* "Magneto-Josephson effects and Majorana bound states in quantum wires", *New J. Phys.* **15** (2013) 115001 doi:10.1088/1367-2630/15/11/115001 [arXiv:1304.7667v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall]]

D. E. Liu and H. U. Baranger, "Detecting a Majorana-Fermion Zero Mode Using a Quantum Dot", *Phys. Rev.* **B84** (2011) 2013080(R), [arXiv: 1107.4338v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall]]

D.J. Wineland, C. Monroe, W.M. Itano, D. Leibfried, B.E. King, D.M. Meekhof, "Experimental issues in coherent quantum-state manipulation of trapped atomic ions", *J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Tech.* **103** (1998) 259 [arXiv:quant-ph/9710025v2]

[14] F. Gliozzi, J. Scherk and D. I. Olive, "Supersymmetry, Supergravity Theories and the Dual Spinor Model," *Nucl. Phys.* **B122** (1977) 253.

F. Gliozzi, J. Scherk and D. I. Olive, "Supergravity and the Spinor Dual Model," *Phys. Lett.* **B65** (1976) 282.

[15] P. A. Grassi and S. Guttenberg, "On Projections to the Pure Spinor Space," JHEP **1112** (2011) 089 [arXiv:1109.2848 [hep-th]].

[16] R. H. Swendsen, "Monte Carlo Renormalization Group," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42** (1979) 859.

M. Falcioni, G. Martinelli, M. L. Paciello, G. Parisi and B. Taglienti, "A New Proposal for the Determination of the Renormalization Group Trajectories by Monte Carlo Renormalization Group Method," *Nucl. Phys.* **B265** (1986) 187.

G. Petropoulos, A. Cheng, A. Hasenfratz and D. Schaich, "Improved Lattice Renormalization Group Techniques," [arXiv:1311.2679 [hep-lat]].

[17] S. Nicolis, "Quantum Mechanics à la Langevin and Supersymmetry",PoS LATTICE **2013** (2013) 355 [arXiv:1311.3487 [hep-lat].]

[18] D. Baumgartner and U. Wenger, "Exact results for supersymmetric quantum mechanics on the lattice," PoS LATTICE **2011** (2011) 239 [arXiv:1201.1485 [hep-lat]].

G. Bergner, F. Bruckmann, Y. Echigo, Y. Igarashi, J. M. Pawlowski and S. Schierenberg, "Blocking-inspired supersymmetric actions: a status report," [arXiv:1212.0219 [hep-lat]].

S. Schierenberg and F. Bruckmann, "Improved lattice actions for supersymmetric quantum mechanics," [arXiv:1210.5404 [hep-lat]].

D. Baumgartner, K. Steinhauer and U. Wenger, "Supersymmetry breaking on the lattice: the N=1 Wess-Zumino model," PoS LATTICE **2011** (2011) 253 [arXiv:1111.6042 [hep-lat]].

C. Wozar and A. Wipf, "Supersymmetry Breaking in Low Dimensional Models," *Annals Phys.* **327** (2012) 774 [arXiv:1107.3324 [hep-lat]].

G. Bergner, "Complete supersymmetry on the lattice and a No-Go theorem," JHEP **1001** (2010) 024 [arXiv:0909.4791 [hep-lat]].

[19] S. Catterall, "Supersymmetric lattices", arXiv:1005.5346 [hep-lat].

S. Catterall, D. B. Kaplan and M. Unsal, "Exact lattice supersymmetry," *Phys. Rept.* **484** (2009) 71 [arXiv:0903.4881 [hep-lat]].

A. D'Adda, I. Kanamori, N. Kawamoto and J. Saito, "Species Doublers as Super Multiplets in Lattice Supersymmetry: Chiral Conditions of Wess-Zumino Model for D=N=2," JHEP **1203** (2012) 043 [arXiv:1107.1629 [hep-lat]].

A. D'Adda, A. Feo, I. Kanamori, N. Kawamoto and J. Saito, "Lattice Supersymmetry: Some Ideas from Low Dimensional Models," PoS LAT **2009** (2009) 051 [arXiv:0910.2924 [hep-lat]].

A. D'Adda, I. Kanamori, N. Kawamoto and K. Nagata, "Twisted N=2 exact SUSY on the lattice for BF and Wess-Zumino," *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **140** (2005) 754 [hep-lat/0409092].

[20] P. Hasenfratz and F. Niedermayer, "Perfect lattice action for asymptotically free theories," *Nucl. Phys.* **B414** (1994) 785 [hep-lat/9308004].

[21] L. O'Raifeartaigh, "Spontaneous Breakdown of Internal Symmetry in Internal Symmetry × Supersymmetry," *Phys. Lett.* **B56** (1975) 41.

[22] A. V. Smilga, "Taming the zoo of supersymmetric quantum mechanical models," JHEP **1305** (2013) 119 [arXiv:1301.7438 [math-ph]].

[23] D. Freed, "Classical field theory and supersymmetry," In Freed, D.S. (ed.) *et al.*: "Quantum field theory, supersymmetry, and enumerative geometry", (IAS/Park City mathematics series **11**) 61-161.

D. S. Freed, "Anomalies and Invertible Field Theories," arXiv:1404.7224 [hep-th].

[24] P. G. O. Freund, "Fermionic Hidden Variables And EPR Correlations," *Phys. Rev.* **D24** (1981) 1526.

V. Dzhunushaliev, "Non-associativity, supersymmetry and 'hidden variables'," *J. Math. Phys.* **49** (2008) 042108 [arXiv:0712.1647 [quant-ph]].

[25] P. A. M. Dirac, "The Lagrangian in quantum mechanics," *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion* **3** (1933) 64.

R. P. Feynman, "Space-time approach to nonrelativistic quantum mechanics," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **20** (1948) 367.

[26] J. B. Hartle, "The Space-time approach to quantum mechanics," Vistas Astron. **37** (1993) 569 [arXiv:gr-qc/9210004].

[27] P. Salomonson and J. W. van Holten, "Fermionic Coordinates and Supersymmetry in Quantum Mechanics," *Nucl. Phys.* **B196** (1982) 509.

J. W. van Holten, "Fermions and worldline supersymmetry," Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **49** (1996) 319 [hep-th/9512068].

J. W. van Holten, "D = 1 supergravity and spinning particles," In Jancewicz, B. (ed.): Sobczyk, J. (ed.): From field theory to quantum groups* 173-189, and Amsterdam NIKHEF - NIKHEF-95-055 (95/10,rec.Oct.) 18 p [hep-th/9510021].

[28] L. Mezincescu, A. J. Routh and P. K. Townsend, "All Superparticles are BPS," arXiv:1401.5116 [hep-th].

[29] M. Creutz, "Emergent spin," arXiv:1308.3672 [hep-lat].

F. Bordi and R. Casalbuoni, "Dirac Propagator From Path Integral Quantization of the Pseudoclassical Spinning Particle," *Phys. Lett.* **B93** (1980) 308.

L. Brink, P. Di Vecchia and P. S. Howe, "A Lagrangian Formulation of the Classical and Quantum Dynamics of Spinning Particles," *Nucl. Phys.* **B118** (1977) 76.

L. Brink, S. Deser, B. Zumino, P. Di Vecchia and P. S. Howe, "Local Supersymmetry for Spinning Particles," *Phys. Lett.* **B64** (1976) 435.

R. Casalbuoni, "Relativity and Supersymmetries," *Phys. Lett.* **B62** (1976) 49.

A. Barducci, R. Casalbuoni and L. Lusanna, "Supersymmetries and the Pseudoclassical Relativistic electron," *Nuovo Cim.* **A35** (1976) 377.

F. A. Berezin and M. S. Marinov, "Particle Spin Dynamics as the Grassmann Variant of Classical Mechanics," *Annals Phys.* **104** (1977) 336.

[30] I. Antoniadis, C. Bachas, C. Kounnas and P. Windey, "Supersymmetry Among Free Fermions and Superstrings," *Phys. Lett.* **B171** (1986) 51.

[31] T. Banks and L. J. Dixon, "Constraints on String Vacua with Space-Time Supersymmetry," *Nucl. Phys.* **B307** (1988) 93.

T. Banks, L. J. Dixon, D. Friedan and E. J. Martinec, "Phenomenology and Conformal Field Theory Or Can String Theory Predict the Weak Mixing Angle?," *Nucl. Phys.* **B299** (1988) 613.

[32] J. Iliopoulos, "Nonrenormalization theorems in global supersymmetry," *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **101** (2001) 99 [hep-th/0103210].

[33] A. Bilal, "Duality in N=2 SUSY SU(2) Yang-Mills theory: A Pedagogical introduction to the work of Seiberg and Witten," hep-th/9601007.

[34] P. Fayet, "Spontaneous Supersymmetry Breaking Without Gauge Invariance," *Phys. Lett.* **B58** (1975) 67.

L. O'Raifeartaigh, "Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking for Chiral Scalar Superfields," *Nucl. Phys.* **B96** (1975) 331.

[35] E. D'Hoker and L. Vinet, "Supersymmetry of the Pauli Equation in the Presence of a Magnetic Monopole," *Phys. Lett.* **B137** (1984) 72.

[36] M. Grana, "Flux compactifications in string theory: A Comprehensive review," *Phys. Rept.* **423** (2006) 91 [hep-th/0509003].

[37] C. Pedder, J. Sonner and D. Tong, "The Berry Phase of D0-Branes," JHEP **0803** (2008) 065 [arXiv:0801.1813 [hep-th]].

[38] M. J. Strassler, "Field theory without Feynman diagrams: One loop effective actions," *Nucl. Phys.* **B385** (1992) 145 [hep-ph/9205205].

D. D. Dietrich, "Hadrons on the worldline, holography, and Wilson flow," arXiv:1312.5718 [hep-ph].

F. Bastianelli, R. Bonezzi, O. Corradini and E. Latini, "Particles with non abelian charges," JHEP **1310** (2013) 098 [arXiv:1309.1608 [hep-th]].